

13 11 '25

The Christian East

A QUARTERLY REVIEW DEVOTED TO THE
STUDY OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES

EDITED BY THE
REV. CANON J. A. DOUGLAS, B.D., Ph.D.,
AND THE REV. R. M. FRENCH, M.A.

DECEMBER, 1924.

Vol. V. No. 4.

1s. 6d.



PUBLISHED FOR
THE ANGLICAN & EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCN.

BY
THE FAITH PRESS, LTD.

At THE FAITH HOUSE, 22, Buckingham Street, Charing Cross, W.C.2.

2s. 6d. per copy, 6s. a year post free.

U.S.A. and Canada 9s. 6d. a year post free.

CONTENTS.

SOME NOTES ON THE POSITION IN SERBIA.—By THE Rt. Rev. J. H. GREIG, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar	145
CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE	150
PAPAL ROME AND THE ORTHODOX EAST.—Prof. GLUBOKOVSKY's Criticism of Mgr. Pierre Batiffol (<i>contd.</i>)	155
MGR. PIERRE BATIFFOL'S REJOINDER	168
AN AUTOGRAPH OF ST. ATHANASIUS THE GREAT. By S. GASELKE	185
ATHENS REVISITED.—By E. KEPHALA	186



At the Liturgy in St. Sophia, for the A. and E.C.A., Wednesday, November 12, 1924.



The Christian East

SOME NOTES ON THE POSITION IN SERBIA.

BY THE RT. REV. J. H. GREIG, D.D., *Bishop of Gibraltar.*

BELGRADE and Serbia have a past not without glory, and full of interest. But it is its present that attracts me most. Nothing is easier than to find fault with the Balkan peoples, and to assert their lack of civilisation, their backwardness, their failures to govern subject races according to the conventional standards of Western Europe. But even if they don't treat a subject race quite as well as, shall we say, Belgium treated the Congo? their history supplies us with a reason, and, yes I will say it, them with an excuse.

But there are other sides and aspects of Serbian life, on which it is not usual to dwell, that give us a glimpse of another side of their character.

Take, for instance, the thirst for knowledge shown by the university students, and the privations they will go through to achieve their course. They outrun the Scotch in the hardness they are ready to endure in order to go on with their studies. It is no unknown event for one of them to be up at five sweeping out offices or doing similar rough work, so as to earn enough for two frugal meals during the day. A bench in the public park is no great hardship during the summer for a young man: but after the summer is over, or before it begins, when nights are cold and damp, it will be the resting place of students who can only afford a bed under a roof once or twice a week. It is almost pathetic, too, to think of the shifts they are put to to find a quiet place or corner in which to study. There are no hostels with rooms in which silence obtains. Nowhere to which they can go freely for light and warmth in their dark and bitterly cold winter. Yet trifles like that do not keep a young fellow from starting student life, nor do they make him abandon it before he has got his diploma and degree. When in the young manhood of a nation such a student-class exists one can prophesy a future. Faults there may be. Brutalities even I will not deny, though, remembering how recently we reformed our penal code and our prisons in England, one

quite small stone is all that I as an Englishman can becomingly throw—and that not very hard. But virility, making eager, costful pursuit for knowledge and desiring to attain wisdom, is an honourable thing in any race.

I would also like to say a word about Serbian monasticism. I think that there attaches to this subject in the minds of those who have heard and thought of it at all, the idea that dirt and ignorance are among its salient characteristics. And it is possible, I am not denying it, that in "Orthodox" countries such monasteries may be found. But in N. Serbia, in the country, say, around Novisar, that description would be grotesquely or malevolently false. I never cease to recall with pleasure the time spent as guest of Serbian monks. My refined and cultured hosts, with their courtesy and charm, are on terms with each other and their guests which remind one, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Common Room of a good Cambridge or Oxford College. They talk seriously, but with light touch, about the things of the day, chaffing one another, enjoying the interchange of thought, and not desiring to monopolise the right of speech. Their meals are frugal but sufficient, and well served, well cooked, clean and pleasant to eye and palate. Their wine from their own vineyards, their honey, their grapes, are excellent. If their own bedrooms are like their guests', they sleep in clean comfort. In some monasteries the standard is not so high in all these directions. But it would be a serious loss to the religious life of the Orthodox Church, and therefore of the whole Church, if Serbian monasticism should die out. G'rgeteg, to mention a striking instance of the sort of monastery I mean, has much the tone of Mirfield; and the Church cannot spare such institutions.

But if a friendly and sympathetic criticism may be made, there is a serious gap in the life of the Orthodox Church in Serbia, but not in Serbia only, that needs to be filled, and that promptly. The Sacraments are duly administered, but there is practically no "Ministry of the Word." The Church possesses some fine preachers, like the Metropolitan of Ochrida, Nikolai, whose eloquence is known in England. And there are occasional sermons at the Belgrade Cathedral and other large centres. But there is no regular and habitual "Ministry of the Word" for the Church as a whole, and in country villages and districts there is no preaching at all.

This silence is easily explained and accounted for by Serbia's past history. But it is certain that without very grievous loss no branch of the Church can ever dispense with its pulpit. The argument as to whether the Ministry of the Word or of the Sacraments is the more important is as if a man desired to argue whether oxygen or hydrogen were the more necessary element in the composition of water. You must have both. And so for the health of any Church

its ministry must be faithful and diligent both as stewards of the mysteries and as preachers and teachers of the everlasting Gospel. How these two act and react, each making the other fruitful, and how the static and dynamic forces of the Church in her corporate life depend for their futures on this action and reaction, giving at once fervour and stability, the change of progress and development without departure from the sure foundation laid long ago, it would be easy to show. But there are two points on which I should like to lay stress, of which one is general, and the other special and pertinent to the present position in Serbia.

The general point which I shall briefly indicate is that the office of preaching and teaching seems truly necessary to the zeal and fervour of the priesthood. I suppose every profession or way of life has its characteristic failure, and in the priestly life ours would seem to be this: that whereas we ought to be men who work at their professional tasks with zest and enthusiasm, we are sadly too apt to be lethargic and unadventurous; doing the same thing in the same way generation after generation, regardless of result, and unaffected by what is going on around us. But with us there are very many splendid exceptions, many very disturbing exceptions, irritating persons, who are for ever urging us to some new practice or view or facet of the truth which gleams so bright in their eyes that they can see nothing else. These—"horrid fellows," "dangerous men," "mere neologists," they are apt to be labelled)—are corporately just that very factor which prevents us ordinary and commonplace priests from settling down into the respectable lethargy that is our loved and sleepful armchair. But all this "yeast" arises in and comes from the duty of being ministers of the Word. This ferment is the ferment of minds engaged in teaching and preaching. It comes to this man and to that as he pushes the analysis of what he has to proclaim a little further, or reviews the evidence for some fact on which we rest our claims, or tries to find a fresh way to apprehend the things he desires to make others eager to grasp. Strange, by reason of human wilfulness, are some of these efforts; and the price we pay for rash guesses and false starts seems very high at times. But the process as a whole is literally priceless, because it is life. We may regret the extravagance, and the irresponsible and the partisan way in which this freedom we enjoy is often used. "Little ones" are hurt and simple souls are perplexed without real need. But the Ministry of the Word committed freely to the priesthood, even if egoism and partisanship and a feeble sense of proportion mar its usefulness, is a necessity for a living priesthood in a living branch of the Church.

And as it is for the corporate life of any branch so it is for the true, the inner and devotional life of the individual minister.* Essential

to the vitality of his religion is the constant study of the message he has to deliver. Not the occasional great sermon, not the finished and polished sentences of a "purple patch," uplift the preacher. But the fact that week in, week out, we have to expound, illuminate, enforce some article of the Faith : that at any moment in any house we may be called on to teach, explain or defend some portion of the truth : that always around us are children to be instructed in The Way : and that to all alike we must be continually trying to proclaim the true relation of the Christian faith to Christian morals and setting forth ideals of conduct for daily life and therefore the constant need for the means of grace and habits of worship ; it is this fact about the ministry which, more than anything else connected with it, keeps the ministers of Christ from utter failure. He who is not a "Minister of the Word," he who has no preaching and teaching to do, no incentive to study and meditation, no prophetic office to fulfil, is deprived of his greatest help and sets about the difficult task of living the priestly life with, as it were, his right arm amputated.

But in the Balkans at this time there is a special and urgent need that this ministry should be revived without delay. Preachers and teachers from without, chiefly from America, are beginning to be heard everywhere. Serbians have gone abroad and sojourned in foreign lands, have heard sermons and had experience of a Christianity which is living and pleading, one, it may be, that proclaims in burning tones love and life, Jesus the Saviour and Healer present here and now, claiming our devotion and the consecration of our lives to His service. And silent churches, which seem rather to enshrine a past than to proclaim a present and living religion ; working with power in their midst, do not satisfy these men ; nor does the occasional outburst of eloquence at Belgrade, or in some other populous centre, supply what they know is needed.

Soon, assuredly soon, must the Church of Serbia become a preaching Church, and its priests "Ministers of the Word," or it will be too late. Nothing else can prevent the best and most fervent Christians among the Orthodox Serbs from leaving the Orthodox Church for some other body, probably some crude form of Protestantism which holds but a fraction of the faith, but holds it with zeal and devotion, and the eloquence that springs therefrom.

No one who knows the past history of that Church can ever judge it hardly. Sympathy and a desire to help must be uppermost in our hearts. But this defect in her mode of working, with its attendant dangers, cries aloud to be remedied, and the deeper and more sincere one's desire to help is, the more earnestly one must wish this silence to give place to the "sure word" of the Gospel. It is certainly the most urgent of the problems which confront the Serbian Church ; and I would that it was put in the forefront of her programme.

That place is taken, not unnaturally, I think, even though I regret it, by another very important matter. Since the Treaty of Versailles and the large increase of territory included in what is now Jugo-Slavia (the Kingdom, as it calls itself, of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes), the Orthodox Church includes no less than five practically independent or completely autocephalous branches of Orthodoxy.

There is the Church of (1) Old Serbia, (2) Bosnia and Herzegovina, (3) Montenegro, (4) Bukovina and Dalmatia, and (5) the Metropolate of Karlovci. These are all "Orthodox Churches," with the same creeds and traditions and practically the same liturgy. But they differ in certain matters of government and in their relations to the State. Montenegro, for instance, depended on the State for the pay of its clergy, while it was the Church of an independent kingdom. Bosnia and Herzegovina and Karlovci are more or less what we should call Endowed Churches; while Bukovina and Dalmatia looked to a Government grant and fees for the income of their ministry. There were like differences also between the mode of appointing Bishops and clergy of other orders. Austria, for reasons of policy, put the Orthodox Churches of her outer provinces under the Œcumenical Patriarch, as being less dangerous to civil order than if they elected their own. It was as a measure of denationalisation that Austria did this and arranged that Bishops for these branches should be approved by the Phanar at Constantinople and consecrated there. Karlovci elected its own Metropolitan, and enjoyed other privileges.

Now, being linked together in one kingdom, and forming the Orthodox Church of Jugo-Slavia, they have drawn up a scheme for a common rule which will obliterate these differences of polity and order, and if this comes into force it will make the Orthodox body one single organic whole. And at the same time as they are obtaining the consent of the State to this new scheme, which has been agreed upon by a general conference of all five elements, they are also claiming from the State an autonomy in religious matters, which, if granted, will put them, as regards the civil power, in more or less the same position as is the Established Kirk in Scotland.

There are grounds for believing that the State will accede to this request, in which case the Church will be able to go forward with much more freedom than at present. The united Synod of all five sections met in November under the presidency of the Patriarch Dimitrie, whose recent coronation as Patriarch may well mark a new and progressive chapter in Serbian Church history. And seeing the great importance of this internal oneness and this new *concordat* with the State, one can well understand why it is given priority over all else. None the less, the restoration of the ministry of preaching and teaching as an essential part of the work of the clerical estate, no less precious and vital than the due administration of the Sacra-

ments, is urgently called for, and should at least be put forward as a coming change which will not be delayed.

On a new and better footing with the State, united in a single body that exists in every part of the kingdom, and proclaiming the Word with that fervour of which a Slav priesthood must be so specially capable, and to which a Slav nation will so readily respond, one could prophesy with confidence that "to-morrow will be a new day," in which the Orthodox Church, using faithfully her freedom, will develop with an efficiency and power that will make it the most glorious period of all her long story. But the conditions must be fulfilled without delay, lest the moment of opportunity should pass away unused.

Belgrade,

October, 1924.

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE.

DEEP sympathy for the sorely tried Œcumenical Patriarchate has been aroused throughout Great Britain by the death of his All-Holiness the Œcumenical Patriarch. Gregory VII. was a man of simple life, quiet, reserved and cautious, designed, as it were, for the difficult task to which, just on a year ago, at the age of 75, God called him. The threats of that critical time will be fresh in the memory of our readers. After eighteen months of remarkably vigorous rule, Meletios IV. had withdrawn to Mt. Athos. The lamentable Treaty of Lausanne had been signed. The Angora Government had possession of Constantinople. A repetition of the Smyrna Holocaust was not impossible. Papa Eftim was noisily in evidence as on the pounce. When Meletios IV. resigned in October, 1923, the prospects were of the stormiest. If the normal procedure of election had been followed, the Turk would certainly have intervened. As it was, after an extemporised and half-secret but canonical method had been adopted, it was doubtful whether dramatic happenings would not follow the *fait accompli*. The thing which saved the situation was the personality of Gregory VII. The most rabid mishellene at Angora was unable to attack him as a traitor and a politician. Accordingly, after some angry frowns, he was allowed to settle to his work of keeping things together. *J'y suis, j'y reste* was his motto and his duty. A Patriarch, so elected, could not accomplish great things. But Gregory VII. will go down to history as a good pastor who was sufficient for his time of danger and anxiety. His memorial is that he comforted his flock in their affliction and preserved the life of the great historic institution of which he was the guardian for a space. The sufferings of the

unhappy Greeks of now wholly islamised and turkified Asia Minor, that remnant of Kemal's Red Harvest, whom he saw deported, *i.e.*, turned from the homes of a hundred generations of their ancestors and flung out to be flotsam and jetsam, in pursuance of the Lausanne monstrosity, added intensely to the suffering pains of the malignant disease by which he was already touched when he ascended the dangerous Throne of St. John Chrysostom. Nevertheless he fulfilled his duties wisely and manfully, and has left the example of a faithful pastor.—*R.I.P.*

* * * * *

At the time of writing, news from Constantinople is awaited anxiously. The abolition of the Khalifate and the expulsion of the Khalif from Turkey were made tolerable to the ordinary Moslem by Kemal's promise to give speedy shrift to the Œcumenical Patriarchate. Delay in the redemption of that promise has been due less to repentance than to his recollection of Lord Curzon's firm intimation in January, 1923, that Europe would not tolerate the wanton destruction of an institution of such historical and cultural importance. The Orthodox of the Patriarchate are now reduced to some 100,000 souls—if that—all resident in Constantinople. None the less, the canonical and free election of Gregory VII.'s successor is vital in particular to the Orthodox Churches of which the Œcumenical Patriarchate, as *primus inter pares*, is the centre, and of great significance in general for Christendom, as the metropolis of which, since 451 A.D., it has been the junior colleague of Old Rome. To run to meet trouble is senseless, but the position will be anxious until a new Patriarch has been enthroned in the Phanar. Meanwhile we note with satisfaction that the Rev. R. F. Borough, the courageous chaplain of the Crimean Memorial Church, took part in the obsequies of Gregory VII. and—a fact of no small note in the history of Anglican and Orthodox relations—sang the Evangel in English, being bidden to do so first among the Gospellers, of whom the others were representatives of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches. Accounts of the Panikhidi at St. Sophia, Bayswater, have been given in our daily press. As we go to press we learn that the Patriarchal Election is in process, and will be completed on December 14.

* * * * *

There are names which we treasure in the history of our movement—J. M. Neale, E. B. Pusey, H. Liddon, Bishops John Wordsworth and Collins, W. J. Birkbeck and many another. They were much in our minds during the Anniversary of our Association on November 11th and 12th, for they laboured without encouragement and we have entered into their labours in a measure which only their splendid hope has made possible. Thus it is less than ten years since W. J. Birkbeck passed to rest, but would he have held it

credible that in 1924, the A. and E.C.A. would keep its festival by the singing of the All-Night Vigil in the Russian Church in London and by the Liturgy celebrated pontifically in St. Sophia, Moscow Road, by a Metropolitan of the Œcumenical Patriarchate? Or that the preacher at both services would be an Anglican—at the latter, indeed, that Dean of Canterbury who, until recently, was the trusted domestic Chaplain of the Primate of All England? In spite of the worst type of London November weather, the congregations both at St. Philip's and at the Greek Cathedral were noticeably large. At the former, the world-famous Kedroff quartette rendered the All-Night Office to wonderful old Slav melodies. Canon Douglas made the Appeal for the proposed Higher Spiritual Academy the text on which to urge the need of helping the Russian Church to furnish herself with missionaries, equipped to undo the appalling ruin worked in the young of the Russian city by Soviet materialistic education, and a welcome sign of the solidarity of the Orthodox, the Metropolitan Germanos pontificated. At the latter, the service was of that otherwise unparalleled mystic beauty which is peculiar to the Orthodox Rite; the singing was exquisite, and two Anglican Bishops assisted, as witness our frontispiece. At the evening meeting in the Church House, Sir H. H. Slesser failed us at the last moment, but Mr. Stephen Graham and Mr. Riley spoke well on the position in the Succession States (Lithuania, Poland, etc.), and the Seventh Council respectively. As Bishop Gore, who presided, said, the A. and E.C.A. may well be heartened to even further impossibilities. By the way, though, is the Association quite right in the numbering of its Anniversaries which made this the 18th? A. and E.C.A. is an amalgamation of the historic Eastern Church Association and the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches Union. The former was founded fully 50 years ago, the latter in 1906. When the two were united in 1914, E.C.A. not only furnished a distinguished contingent of members, but a handsome reserve fund which, so long as it lasted, removed the new A. and E.C.A. from its present anxiety *re* its living agents' stipends. Strictly, the recent anniversary should be styled the tenth, if the reckoning is made from the Amalgamation. But A. and E.C.A. has a goodly heritage and we can boast that we are in succession to J. M. Neale and the founders of E.C.A. Why not take our era from the foundation of the latter? The Rev. R. M. French, our new general secretary, may be congratulated on the great success of his first Anniversary.

Following quickly after the A. and E.C.A. anniversary, the Oxford Undergraduates' Society for Reunion, initiated only a year back with Mr. J. H. Tayler of New College as President, and the Rev. W. R. Corbould as Warden, made its first great venture. On November, 25th, the Vice-Chancellor of the University (Dr. Wells, Warden of Wadham) took the chair at a packed meeting in Wadham College

Hall. Bishop Gore, the Metropolitan Germanos, and Mr. Athelstan Riley were the speakers. A message from our Primate and a charming letter from Cardinal Mercier were read. The Regius Professor of Divinity (Canon Goudge), Drs. Kidd, Lock, Pullan and other distinguished theologians were on the platform. Next morning the Liturgy was celebrated in the University Church itself with full ceremonial, incense, lights, cantors, etc., Bishop Shaw pontificating and Archbishops Germanos and Anastasy, served by Dr. Goudge and Canon Douglas as deacons of honour, assisting. To the thoughtful mind no greater sign of the times can be found than this, as the *Church Times* rightly called it, "remarkable achievement."

A full report of that Oxford meeting and of the addresses given at it may be had for 6d. from Mr. J. H. Tayler, New College, Oxford, or the General Secretary, A. and E.C.A., who will also be glad to forward for 1s. the translation of the All-Night Vigil—a much-needed addition to the students' library—made by Fathers Timotheiev and Theokritoff, of St. Philip's, for the A. and E.C.A. anniversary.

We were greatly struck by the contrast which the Dean of Canterbury drew out in his anniversary sermon between the Anglican approach to Reunion and the Orthodox, *viz.*, that, while the Anglican is prone to fix his mind on the finding dogmatic agreement with a view to full Reunion (*e.g.*, the Lambeth Encyclical), the Orthodox rather considers how, no such Reunion being imminent, the Churches may get into the fullest comity and amity possible and so into active co-operation (*e.g.*, the Œcumenical Patriarch's Encyclical, January, 1920). The Metropolitan Germanos developed the thesis in Wadham Hall, showing how, without "internal" union (Intercommunion), the Churches could reach a great measure of "external" union (Co-operation). Assuredly, it would appear that the Orthodox are more practical as well as more liberal than many of us Westerns. No compromise of principle, but the maximum possible of zealous operant brotherhood among all who profess and call themselves Christians, is the right formula. Love must be the prime agent of union.

The visit of Canon Bate to Bucharest in October, by the arrangement of Dr. Gore and with the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, is likely to prove fruitful, as well as a memorable event. Canon Bate, who went specially to give a course of public lectures on the Church of England under the auspices of the Orthodox Ladies' Society of Roumania, held many conferences with theologians and hierarchs, *e.g.*, with the Metropolitan Miron Christea, Fathers Galaktion and Scriban, Dr. Michalescu and our friend, Professor Ispir. *En retour* he visited Sofia and Belgrad. His impressions are optimistic.

* * * * *

Archbishop Anastasy of Bessarabia, until recently in charge of the Russian exiles in Constantinople, visited London in November,

being the guest of the Cowley Fathers at their Westminster house of St. Edward, which he describes as "peaceful and strict as a Russian Monastery." The purport of his visit was concerned with Russian Church property in Palestine. Nevertheless, he utilised his time to see something of Anglican life, being entertained by the Archbishop at Lambeth, the Bishop of London at Fulham, attending the Oxford meetings and assisting at services at St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey. At the former, where he gave the blessing, Canon Simpson, the preacher, announced his presence in felicitous words, concluding: "To be blessed by a representative of that martyred Church, which has been called in no ordinary degree to fill up what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ is, we shall all feel, to be sprinkled in a peculiar sense with the Blood that speaketh better things than that of Abel." By his modesty and charm Archbishop Anastasy has carried our hearts away with him.

* * * * *

We rejoice that the Anglo-Catholic Pilgrimage of 1924 is planned to be repeated in 1925, with the addition of visits to Cyprus, Patmos, Constantinople and Athens. The Pilgrimage starts on April 27th., lasts three weeks and costs only sixty guineas. All particulars may be had of Sir Henry Lunn, Endsleigh Gardens, N.W. We make this extract from the brochure prepared for the Pilgrims:—

"In addition to the wonderful secular objects and places which they will see, *e.g.*, the Parthenon and Acropolis at Athens, the Dardanelles, the walls of Constantinople and a hundred others, and in addition to the varied interest of the life of the countries, Egyptian, Arab, Syrian, Turkish, Greek, with which they will be in contact, they will pay their devotions at shrines to visit which must be the crown of devotion. There they will worship in the great Cypriote Cathedral of Nikosia, will pray in the "Mother Church of Christendom," as Gibbon termed Justinian's St. Sophia, that marvel of Christian piety still perverted to be a Mosque, and will offer their devotions in the ruined Church of St. John at Smyrna. As they do so, and indeed throughout their Way, for from the time they pass Malta they will be in the path along which St. Paul passed on his wondrous journeys, they may be assured that, if they have faith, the spirit of the great Apostle will be in contact with theirs at Athens, in the Castle Crown of Smyrna, on the Straight Road of Ephesus, and that they will receive gifts of courage, constancy and zeal from their intercession.

"Moreover, those who make this Pilgrimage will have the joy of knowing that they are missionaries of Christian Reunion and will be received as such both by the chief Bishops and by the simple folk of that superb Eastern Church from whom the West first received the Faith."

(Continued on p. 192.)

PAPAL ROME AND THE ORTHODOX EAST.

PROF. GLUBOKOVSKY'S CRITICISM OF MGR. PIERRE BATIFFOL.

(Continued.)

IV.

ALL the cases of appeal quoted by Mgr. P. Batiffol are such as to allow of different interpretations.¹ By themselves, their

¹ And, generally speaking, all the examples given by Mgr. P. Batiffol are not sufficiently decisive. Although the letter of Flavian of Constantinople to Leo I. is called in the badly-distorted Latin text an "apellatio," the former (who refers to Dioscorus of Alexandria as "venerable"!) says that he formerly applied to "the Throne of the Apostolic See of the Prince of the Apostles, the Apostle Peter, and to all the Blessed Council under the purview of the Pope," but now seeks opportunity to render a service to the distressed faith of the holy Fathers by procuring the convention on his own initiative of the united Council of the Western and Eastern Fathers. Leo I. found the measure asked for unnecessary, reckoning that it would be sufficient if he merely signed the Tomos; but, in spite of the Pope's disapproval, the Council of Chalcedon took place and the Pope was obliged to participate in it in the usual way.—Eusebius of Dorylæum "applies as the oppressed, seeking for help in misfortunes which have befallen him," because "from the very beginning the Apostolic throne has been wont (*ab exordio consuevit*) to defend the injured and to help those who have fallen victims to unavoidable evil designs, and, so far as it could, to raise those lying low," and "because you have sympathy to all men."—In the affair of Iddua of Ephesus, his accusers, convicted by the decision of the Bishop and the Council of Constantinople, desired to gain over to their side Rome, but Xystus agreed with the decision. There is nothing there in favour of the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope; besides, the complaints against him were accepted, *e.g.*, by Nestorius, who did not even think of applying to Celestine as the authority.—Nor is anything to be gained by stressing the fact that Liberius, a mild Arian, declared as irregular the excommunication of Eustathius of Sebastia, himself a mild Arian; while there was nothing extraordinary in the applying to Rome for help after the manner of St. Athanasius. That is why Basil the Great does not find any actual violation of canon law in the acts of his friend, whom he always supported, notwithstanding his treachery. Protest was made to the Pope against the whole Council, in claim an Œcumenical Council, but in fact a "Robber-Synod"; but there was no way out there, and, in result, the matter was settled not by the Pope's decision but by another Council, that of Chalcedon.—In these appeals the Roman See is called Apostolic, and its origin is ascribed to St. Peter. Nestorius, indeed, in his apology "Le livre d'Héraclide," entitles Leo I., "le siège de Saint Pierre et l'honneur apostolique"; on the other hand, in the East St. Paul's name is often mentioned, together with that of St. Peter; even the fathers of the Council of Rome (680 A.D.), in their message to Constantinople, speak of "the Light of the teaching of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith, emanating from the source of all light—Christ, through the Prince-Apostles, Peter and Paul, and their successors on the Roman See, down to the (then) present Agathon." Generally speaking, ancient ecclesiastical writers do not mention St. Peter as exclusively the founder of the Roman See, but state that the Roman Church was founded by two Apostles. St. John Chrysostome represented the Bishop of Antioch as the successor of the Apostle Peter in no less degree than the being so was appropriated to himself

only significance is probably that the papacy has used them to establish dogmas which are contrary to the minds of their authors in appealing to Rome. All these appeals in themselves were also only private acts called out by imperative historical circumstances. Supposing, however, even that one or the other Orthodox hierarchy did accept papal supremacy, his having done so would merely compromise himself, and could no more be looked upon as a ground for making any inference concerning the whole Orthodox East, than, *e.g.*, the Florentine Council can be looked upon as proving that the Orthodox Greeks and Russians submitted to the Papacy. Indeed, exceptions only prove the rule. Therefore, it is necessary yet to prove that the facts under discussion had a normal character and expressed the actual voice of the Orthodox Church.

It is necessary to give facts having the authority of the whole Church. Hence the new series of examples supplied by Mgr. P. Batiffol. He agrees that "sans doute aucun canon oriental ne prévoit les appels," and quite correctly does not ascribe any particular importance to the Council of Sardica, "mais aucun canon oriental, jusqu'à Photios, n'a interdit les appels."

This kind of argument does not convince me, because, to say the least, it admits of a double interpretation:—"did not prohibit" because it was looked upon by all as lawful, or "did not prohibit" because cases actually did not exist. The second alternative is as much admissible as the first, and, when further development gives rise to the conclusion that when (as at the time of Photios and later on) the claim came out in its true aspect it was rejected as illegal and no longer permissible, although earlier it was allowed on account of its vagueness and because of the historic conditions.

It stands to reason, then, that what really is required are exact and

by the Roman Pontiff; that is why Chrysostome applied in his personal affairs to the Pope in the same manner as he applied to Venerius, Bishop of Milan, and to Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia.—Rome laboured hard in order to obliterate or to obscure the shade from its Christian story, the name and part played therein by the Apostle Paul. Finally, by the mouth of the Pope Nicholas in the time of the Patriarch Photios, it announced that even the Church of Jerusalem did not possess clear marks of being an Apostolic See, though, on the other hand, the Orthodox Church commemorates James of Jerusalem as "the Successor of the First-ruler Christ," to whom "Christ transferred the Throne of the Church."

¹ It is in this light that, from the Eastern standpoint, I regard the formula of Hormisdas, signed on March 28th, 519 A.D., by John, Patriarch of Constantinople, who lowered himself to that repugnant formality. . . . In that formula the incontrovertible Supremacy of the Roman Throne is actually proclaimed. But the proclamation remained only a Papistic opinion which, though forced upon John for the moment, was at once fiercely and stubbornly repudiated throughout the Provinces (even by Thessalonica), which was finally repudiated by Constantinople, and which never even attempted to gain sanction in the East.

¹ *Christian East*, February, 1924; p. 30.

authoritative testimonies of the Church testifying its subjection to the Popes in order that all private acts of this kind should receive interpretation as being performed on a principle. Mgr. P. Batiffol indeed submits arguments of such a character. First of all the historian Socrates (II, 17) is quoted, that *μη δειν παρὰ γνώμην ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης κανονίζειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας*. But—and this is most important—this is only a private opinion, and in order to represent it “comme un canon organique (? !) de l'Eglise,” Mgr. P. Batiffol is compelled to have recourse to Prof. Ad. Harnack's subjective supposition that it reproduces a formula of Pope Julius I., the very Pope who was most categorically opposed by the Eastern Fathers on the ground that he, being haughty with the greatness of his See, had meddled in other people's affairs, to no purpose and illegally (on the question about St. Athanasius). But, even admitting this doubtful hypothesis, we have only a Pope's opinion and not the canonical norm of the Eastern Church. Further, Socrates is not a church authority. More, he is not a theologian, he is a notary, an advocate. Therefore, his expressions, though juridically categorical, are exaggerated in a theological sense and are lacking in precision in a canonical sense. Hence, further, his words may be referring not to the canon-formation (legislature), but to the moment of “receptio,” since parts of the Church had not to accept anything as œcumenically obligatory until the same was accepted by the great and famous Roman Church : not as recognition of the validity of Anglican orders will become compulsory for the whole Eastern Church only when the decision of Meletios IV. has been “received” (accepted) by all Orthodox Autocephalous Churches; and as assuredly the decisions of the “Pan-Orthodox Congress” in Constantinople (May-June, 1923) can cherish no hope of becoming œcumenically obligatory as they have already been protested against by several Orthodox Church leaders. And, if now and then something actually happened in reverse of the prescribed order, still in itself it bore witness that the highest Church authority, which stood above the Popes and was obligatory for them, existed and was recognised as such. We come here to the most important subject, namely, to the Œcumenical Councils which expressed the law-giving voice of the whole Church. Sanction by them with regard to the Papacy would have been final, and I would submit to it without a word, simply because I am a Christian, but I do not perceive anything giving it, rather I see the reverse. In order to weaken my position, Mgr. P. Batiffol points out (p. 31) that I admit “une exagération manifeste,” when I say that “the whole affair was submitted for re-examination at the Council of Chalcedon, which alone reinstated Theodore.” If I do not “strain” again at verbal “gnats,” then I “insiste” (p. 30) again here on the following points:—

- (a) I am well aware that the Chalcedon Fathers simply refused to deliberate on the whole subject in all its details, but we are not at all concerned with the dogmatico-polemic views and actions of Beatus Theodoret. We are concerned only and exclusively with his juridically canonical rehabilitation. The latter had already been proclaimed categorically by Leo the Great, who was then dominating the whole world. According to the Papistic theory his declaration was not subject to any revision, being obligatory for the whole Church and for all its Councils. However, the most flattering Papal attestation did not forbid that "Theodoret prendra place au banc des accusateurs" appearing as the applicant for his own exculpation, and should be reinstated only after the Council's decision. Does this not mean that the reinstatement was a result of the Council's decision only? and that the Pope's judgment was only a private opinion which assumed the force of law for the whole Church only after the Council's approbation? Indeed, Theodoret was acquitted by the Council of Chalcedon exactly in the same manner as was acquitted Amphilochius of Syd, who was suspected of being an Eutichian. Amphilochius had no recommendation from the Pope, but the Chalcedon Fathers demanded from him precisely that which they demanded from Theodoret, who was approved of by the Pope. Evidently, the Pope's decision did not give any advantage juridically to Theodoret in comparison with Amphilochius.
- (b) Mgr. P. Batiffol writes that "le cas de Théodoret soit réservé, *non qu'il soit douteux*, mais parce qu'il y a contre Théodoret une faction qui ne désarme pas." But next to this I read that during the VIIIth sitting, when the Bishop of Cyrr pronounced anathema on Nestorius, "le bureau prononce alors : tout doute est levé au sujet du très-théophile Théodoret . . . il ne reste plus" (in comparison with the original position) "à votre piété" (*i.e.*, of course to all the members of the Council and not only to les évêques de la faction de Dioscure) "qu'à prononcer que Théodoret doit recouvrer son Eglise, ainsi que le très-saint Léon a jugé." I do not quite comprehend how it is possible to speak about the absence of something doubtful when the doubt has been removed! It is true that the doubt referred to Theodoret, but touching the accused it equally touched the apologist.
- (c) Then for me it is logically compulsory that Theodoret's affair was finally decided not by Leo the Great but by the Council, although in agreement with the Pope, who in this case had shown his authoritative wisdom. It was accepted not

only by the *Collatio Constantinopolitana* (531-533) of the Orthodox with the Monophysites, which stated through Ignatius of Ephesus that the Council of Chalcedon judged the Beatus Theodoret more severely than even St. Cyril of Alexandria, but also by Pope Vigilius, who, in his written opinion on "the three heads" of 14th May, 553, declared that there could not even be a question of condemning Theodoret because he was acquitted by the Council of Chalcedon. Therefore the latter indeed was, and was accepted as such even by Rome, the last and final court of appeal.

It follows further that the authority of the Councils was generally looked upon throughout the East as higher than that of the Popes. In this respect the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon is very important. Contrary to my words it does not trouble Mgr. P. Batiffol at all, and rightly, *in the light of its Papistic interpretation*, although it is not quite clear why it is that the matter is treated by him at such length—quite beyond the needs of the question under consideration. But if one deals with the views and beliefs of the Orthodox Easterns of that time, then this canon must perforce "trouble" the Roman Catholics very much, as entirely overthrowing their theory that "le catholicisme grec . . . professait au temps du concile de Chalcédoine" the doctrine of Papal Supremacy. On this matter Mgr. P. Batiffol asks: "dès l'instant que le pape Léon repousse ce canon comment pourrait-on lui donner cette valeur," i.e., of an œcumenical canon? A negative answer is unchallengeable only for the Papistic mind, and not at all for the Orthodox right conscience, which has every reason for finding out how far and in what part the Council of Chalcedon was for the Popes an Œcumenical Council, although it has always been reckoned as such even by the Papacy. And, generally speaking, is it possible to determine "œcumenicity" at so many per cent.? Is such arithmetical dosing permissible? If there was a mistake on this point in Chalcedon, one involuntarily recollects St. James' vote: "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." (James II, 10.) That is why "*haeretecis aut nihil aut totum licet*," as Bishop Success said at the Council of Carthage in 256 A.D. Remember also what was said by the learned Carthaginian Deacon Fulgentius Ferrand, who is reckoned, I think, as a saint in the Roman Church, about the revision of the matter of "the three heads." He exclaims in perplexity: Is it possible for one and the same spring to give sweet water and bitter water? No, because "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (I Cor., V, 6). Revision of the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon cannot be

tolerated even in a single item ; the whole Council of Chalcedon is true, because it is the Council of Chalcedon in all its entirety : not one part of it may be censured, because all that was there said, done, deliberated and affirmed, was accomplished in totality by the ineffable mystical power of the Holy Ghost.

I feel obliged to concur with the fiery Carthaginian, as otherwise there will appear too much of the incomprehensible and contradictory. It is certain that the 28th canon of the Council of Chalcedon only develops the conception shortly expressed in the 3rd canon of the Second Œcumenical Council and, in particular, makes it clear that the dignity of the Roman See was due to the status of the town as the capital. This is not said there directly, but so far as the rise of the See of Constantinople was effected by the rise of Constantinople as the capital, Rome was afraid that, having lost its position as the capital, it might lose its ecclesiastical position, and that the status of its See might fall even below that of Byzantium. However, Rome never accepted the 3rd canon, actually protested against it, although not so formally at the time, and did not declare openly that the Second Council in this particular case was not Œcumenical. When the inevitability of such a declaration became clear later on, it had to be antedated, and what was said about the Council of Chalcedon had to be said about the Second Council, as what was said about the Council of Chalcedon had an adequate force for the Second and, *vice versa*, what was lawful in the one case was incontestable in the second.

On this point, perfectly honestly, I do not understand, and cannot make my own, the Roman Catholic, point of view in the matter, and for myself personally find here only objective, and not polemic, obscurities and variances. Therefore, I must treat the matter with rational consistency, and it was in this sense that I stated in my article not as an opinion of my authoritative opponent, but as a necessary logical sequence—that he should accept the 28th canon of the Council of Chalcedon “as having undoubtedly the value of a canon of an Œcumenical Council.” It is quite natural that Mgr. P. Batiffol does not accept it, and points out now that nothing could be Œcumenical that was not recognised by the Pope, because he represented not less than a half of the whole co-Catholic Christianity. According to my opinion and deep conviction it is a question of the “receptio” and not of the Œcumenical compulsoriness of the decisions of the Councils. Besides, this claim was not at all accepted by the East, but was even refuted by it, and it was not accepted by the Frank Churches at the time of Charles the Great. We also know that when Pope Vigilius declared himself to be a half of the whole Christian world, the Emperor Justinian gave to him not more than one-fifth and made a stand on the point. Arithmetic is not much in

favour of the Papacy in this case, but, generally speaking, it is not proper in matters of this kind. Jesus Christ forewarned: "When the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" (Luke XVIII, 8), "because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold" (Matthew XXIV, 12). Can anyone say that at that time no œcumenically obligatory truth will not exist, and that it will only remain the confession of a few and not compulsory for "receptio" by all? And if the latter will not accept it, will it stand as an accusation and stint for the confessors and not as a conviction and rejection for themselves? The truth is absolute and does not depend on the numbers of the followers of the Papacy, as actually was the case, *e.g.* in the period of Arianism. Therefore, *from their own point of view*, the Catholics are right in proclaiming some of their separatist Councils as œcumenical and demanding the recognition of them as such by all Christians. The same is perfectly correct also for the Orthodox East in relation to the Papistic West.

In explanation of the protest by Leo the Great against the 28th canon, Mgr. P. Batiffol adds (p. 33) that by this he did not allow "*amoindrir la personne du pape*," suspecting that "Constantinople tend à créer à son propre profit en Orient une primauté, et une primauté d'essence politique." Such a supposition does not seem to be feasible in view of the fact that in the Eastern Church the conciliar principle was reigning and can be explained only by the fear that the papal claim of œcumenical supremacy might be limited. But let it be so! The import of this does not lie in the fact but exclusively in the inference that if the East was supposed to wish to set up its own Papacy the fact would have meant that the East did not look upon the Roman Papacy as the only one possible, incontestable, sacred. Where is then that belief in the Roman supremacy of the Orthodox Greeks in the time of the Council of Chalcedon?

In order to justify Papal polemics against the 28th canon of the Councils of Chalcedon, it is said that, the canon having a political character, "*cette notion de droit ecclésiastique n'allait à rien moins qu'à déposséder le siège de Saint-Pierre au profit de l'évêque de Ravenne*" (p. 34), to which place the Emperor Honorius transferred his western capital in 408 A.D. To these opinions of the excellent Catholic savant, L. Duchesne (with whose opinions I seem to agree in my previous remarks about the Papistic interpretation) Mgr. P. Batiffol adds the text of the 28th canon in order to persuade me that it does not acknowledge "prerogatives of Apostolic origin" as belonging to ancient Rome. That is just what I state, reckoning it to be very significant that the analysed canon keeps complete silence about the Apostolic prerogatives of Rome and entirely levels it up with Constantinople on the ground of other reasons quite independ-

ently of the Papal claims. And if there was a danger of Cæsaro-Papism *in potentia*, then at the different orientation do not we see Papo-Cæsarism *in re*? In view of the position the different opinions about the political decision in respect of the dignity of episcopal Sees were possible. For instance, St. Gregory Nazianzen (*Sermo XLII*) calls the town of Constantinople "the eye of the universe, the mightiest on the land and on the sea, as it were, the mutual knot of the East and the West, whither and whence, as from the universal fair, comes everything that is the most important in the faith." Analogous arguments are put forth by S. Irenæus of Lyons on behalf of the privileges of the Roman Church (*Adv. hæres.* III, 3 : 2), *viz.*, that she is the guardian of the Apostolic traditions in so far as Rome, being the capital, has been for all Christians—bearers of those traditions—a natural rallying point after the meaning of the 9th canon of the Council of Antioch.¹

However, I have not been called to, and dare not defend the authority of, the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon. All these discussions seem to be irrelevant to our subject, and do not touch it at all. Let us assume, then, that the East erred in this point. In any case, the incontrovertible fact remains that the East did not profess the Papal exclusive primacy and absolutely rejected it. Mgr. P. Batiffol refers (p. 34) to the fact that the Fathers of Chalcedon applied to Leo the Great for recognition of the 28th canon, and asserts that the Pope guided them as the head guides the members of the body. This is true *verbatim*, but the latter analogy *ad capiendum benevolentia*, is equally uncomplimentary for both sides, is not at all "une subordination catégorique" even as far as the phrasing goes, and in its meaning does not advance beyond the "supremacy" of the 34th Apostolic canon, as in S. Theodore Studitos, with whom "the primacy of honour" of Rome did not give her the right "to soar on her own wings," so as not to be comparable with the other Patriarchates. Indeed, in the light of the facts, the request of the Fathers of Chalcedon is as comprehensible in the interests of the œcumenical "receptio" as is undoubtedly the diplomatic flattery of expressions which represented for the Byzantines a usual political manœuvre. The whole force of the matter lies exclusively in the fact that this canon was voluntarily accepted as agreed by the Eastern Bishops in spite of the objections raised by the Papal legates on the ground of the boldly interpolated 6th Nicæan canon: *Romana ecclesia semper habuit primatum*. Although this falsification was

¹ I must mention in anticipation that I am also conversant enough with the Papistic interpretation of this "famous text," for which *vide, e.g.*, Michel d'Herbigny, S. J., un Newman russe, Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900) Paris, 3/911, p. 178 (with reference to "Revue Bénédictine," Janvier 1910, pp. 103-108); *Theologia de Ecclesia* II Parisiis 2/921, p. 158 sqq., p. 288

again put forth by Rome in Carthage 40 years later, it was documentally disproved and the matter remained as before. The 28th canon of Chalcedon has always remained and still remains a binding, active norm in the Eastern Church, notwithstanding the systematic and unremitting opposition of the Papacy, which was obviously not recognised there as the supreme resort in the Church of Christ. Nothing beyond this is stated or defended by me.

V.

Further, in my judgment it follows necessarily that the Councils were regarded by the East as superior to the Popes, who were subordinated to them. That is the last point in my controversy with Mgr. P. Batiffol which calls for some explanatory remarks on my part. Here my esteemed opponent reads me a lecture as to the mutual relations of the sides (p. 36) that presumably I hold wrongly, that "les conciles œcuméniques appartiennent à la constitution divine de l'Eglise: ils n'appartiennent qu'au *Kirchenrecht*. Ils ne sont pas, en effet, une institution du Christ ou des apôtres. . . . Les conciles œcuméniques ne sont jamais nécessaires." That is exactly what I did state with regard to the Papacy, and I am quite sure of the matter. I am well aware, indeed, that on the authority of the Vatican Council it has been decreed doctrinally that Councils are not necessary, that they are subordinated to the Pope, and that everything else is only—*minutiae scholasticae dogmaticae catholicae*, as to which, moreover, there is no complete formularisation in detail, according even to Mgr. P. Batiffol's own words in *Revue de Jeunes* (10 April, 1923, p. 16), although he speaks now more categorically. I have no concern with all these minute details in the present discussion of the relations of Councils and Popes, which (*i.e.*, Councils and Popes) Mgr. P. Batiffol claims to be in "co-ordination," in the sense that the Pope—infallible *in sese*, *non ex consensu ecclesiae*—may consult the Council, if he deems it useful for himself. I am aware of that Roman Catholic dogma, and on this occasion I offer no criticism of it, but only maintain that the East neither accepted it, nor, since it still holds to its position, has relinquished any of its former beliefs. In contradiction, Mgr. P. Batiffol asserts even now (p. 36) that "cette coordination a toujours été la règle même au temps où Saint Léon faisait précéder le concile de Chalcédoine de sa lettre à Flavien." But the fact is that the Council in question was called together neither by the Pope nor with the view that the Pope might consult with it. It was summoned in spite of the definite opposition of Leo the Great, who had declared that the calling together of a Council was quite unnecessary: When it was convened he attempted to dominate it and, in some questions, to go against it. The like happened in other cases.

The significance of all this is that for the East the Councils were, in fact, the supreme institution. But, "ils ne sont pas, en effet, une institution du Christ ou des apôtres." I shall allow myself to make use on this occasion of Mgr. P. Batiffol's reasoning on the Papal Supremacy. He writes (p. 35): "Nous ne construirions pas l'institution de l'épiscopat monarchique sur les textes du Nouveau Testament qui nous parlent des *ἐπίσκοποι* de l'âge apostolique, mais l'épiscopat monarchique a son anticipation, sa justification dans ces textes. Il en est de même du privilège apostolique revendiqué et exercé par les papes : ils se raccorde à la primauté de l'apôtre Pierre qui en est l'anticipation et qui l'autorise." I think that Mgr. P. Batiffol, even under these conditions, recognises the "épiscopat," together with the Papacy, as "la constitution divine de l'Eglise."

Let us apply the same method to verify the conciliar principle. We find that Jesus Christ Himself entrusted the supreme power to the whole Church (St. Matth. XVIII, 17), and the Church from the very first days of her existence acts with her plenitude ; though put forward by Peter, who generally spoke in the name of all, Matthias was elected in the place of Judas by the assembly of all the disciples (Acts III, 12 sqq ; IV, 1) ; the seven deacons were appointed by the multitude of the disciples in accordance with the suggestion of the Twelve (Acts VI, 2, 5) ; St. Paul was sent to preach by the plenary authority of the Church, and submitted to her his report (Acts VI, 13 ; XIV, 26 sqq. ; XV, 40) ; he went to Jerusalem to communicate unto all the brethren, and especially unto those who seemed to be pillars (Gal. II, 2 sqq.), and particularly unto James and the elders (Acts XXI, 18 sqq.), as did Peter also (Acts XII, 17) : the question then in controversy, on which even Peter himself was to be blamed (Gal. II, ii sqq.), viz., as to the conditions for receiving Gentiles into Christianity, was decided by the Council of Jerusalem, about which it is recorded explicitly that, as it always is, the pleasure of the Holy Spirit who acts in the Church as the external Teacher and Interpreter of divine truth, was operant in it (St. John XVI, 16 etc.). As soon as communities of the Church were organised, the conciliar principle began to function in them more or less regularly, and became the normal principle of Church administration ; so that when with the triumph of Christianity the closest community of the Churches was brought about the Œcumenical Councils came into being.

Such are the historical facts. And if I be asked, Was this principle an ecclesiastical or a divine institution ? the question seems to me to invite idle deviation from our real purpose for indulgence in a theoretical strife of words (*cf.* I Tim., VI, 4). I see that the conciliar principle was the supreme regulating factor of the very life of the undivided Church, which was itself permeated by it, was built and

developed by it independently of any "heads" and authorities, and, therefore, did not exist normally and really except with it as its element. But since the conciliar principle has always from the very beginning been a fundamental and vital principle of the divine Church of Christ, and cannot be divided from the very existence of that divine institution, I must naturally esteem it as of divine origin. Further, in the matter of biblical warranty it is hardly surpassed by any of the sacraments (even on the Roman Catholic method of fixing the category), while, assuredly, it satisfies perfectly the above-mentioned criterion put forth by Mgr. P. Batini.

In any case the conciliar principle has always been the supreme normal regulator of church order. This was a fact, and one so necessary and obligatory that the supremacy of the Œcumenical Councils was recognised in the East, and was admitted in the West, where, *e.g.*, in rebutting the Papal claims, it was defended by S. Cyprian and Beatus Augustine, whilst Fulgentius Ferrand firmly testified that the authority of the Œcumenical Councils occupied the first place after that of the canonical books of the Bible. It is true that in the West various kinds of "*reservatio mentalis*" were in use from very old times, and that the Popes tried to elevate themselves above the Councils, but they were, all the same, compelled to submit to them as we see, *e.g.*, in the case of the Trullan Council. Even such a Papistic coryphæus as was Leo I. was compelled "to co-ordinate" with the Council of Chalcedon, although the latter was convened against his wishes. At a much later date Gregory the Great (590-604), who proclaimed the equality of all bishops, declared in Constantinople that he acknowledged the four Œcumenical Councils as the four Gospels, and that he recognised the fifth as equal in honour to the first four. The Pope Vigilius refused to participate in the fifth Council, and was absent, but afterwards he wrote to "my beloved brother Eutychius," the Patriarch of Constantinople, that formerly he "had violated love by standing away from the brethren" and that "in defending his teaching he acted as a tool in the hands of the devil, but Christ, our God, had warded off all temptation from his thoughts" (Mansi XI, 413). But, generally, the Popes, through their legates, used to take an active part in the Œcumenical Councils, although the Councils were not convened by the Popes, and though they were not always convened in accordance with their wishes, though certainly they never played a part of the Papal consultative apparatus, and though there were cases when the Councils were called together notwithstanding the Papal declaration that the convening was unnecessary. The Councils were the independent and the supreme judiciary legislative and juridically-doctrinal tribunal of the saving Church (*ecclesia salvifica*) of Christ for teaching and administration.

I do not defend anything and I do not refute anyone, and it sincerely hurts me that—contrary to my intentions and aspirations—a “ paragraph ” of this kind has called forth an unexpected remark by Mgr. P. Batiffol (p. 35) that he “ n’a plus guère trait à considération d’histoire, et rentra un peu trop pour goût dans la manière polémique.” I in no way sympathise with Church Parliamentaryism. I am an enemy of every kind of demagogy and autocracy, and I prefer everywhere a sane lawful monarchism. But facts are facts, and in this case they are of such an extraordinary character that the Patriarchal and Synodal message of the Church of Constantinople, in the time of Anthimos VII., of August, 1895 (in reference to the Encyclical Letter of Leo XIII. of 20th June, 1894) definitely states: “ Seven holy Œcumenical Councils being called together in the Holy Spirit for the explanation of the true teaching of the faith against the heretics, have universal and eternal significance in the Church of Christ.” It follows that, if the facts above stated by us may be regulated in some new direction, it may be done only by Church Œcumenical decision, and even then it will only be a special application of them without the lessening their importance in principle. Examining it from the point of view of a theoretical possibility, I do not reckon as heretical the concession made by the most Orthodox Metropolitan Anthony in favour of the Papal supremacy, but, granted it be made only by the decision of the whole Church, would be under the supreme control of Œcumenical Councils.

The latter are for us Orthodox the only supreme resort in the Church. We cannot change this position and we must always start from it. All others must reckon with it, if not positively, then negatively, but absolutely and unfailingly. And so, when we are told that at some time past, before the fatal division, we recognised the Papal Supremacy in the Roman Catholic sense, I can acquiesce with the statement, not before and not otherwise than but only on condition that I shall be shown the corresponding canon of an Œcumenical Council. But, did any Council decree anything of this kind? Was there not rather something quite contrary to that? Let those who choose repeat that none the less the Eastern Fathers and Doctors did profess this truth. To me it is incomprehensible why they did not formulate this truth as a dogma if they looked upon it as universally obligatory *de jure divino*. Were there fewer opinions and arguments about this matter than about the majority of the articles of the Nicene Creed? If the Pope was juridically the last tribunal of appeals in the whole Church, where was the right formally legalised, as it was done, *e.g.*, for the See of Constantinople in relation to other Patriarchs by Justinian in his novella of 530 A.D.? So far I have not seen anything of the kind, but I find testimony to the contrary. I find that Flavian of Antioch did not appear before the

Pope for judgment, although the latter had demanded it, and that the Council of Constantinople in 879, in the presence of the Papal Legates, and without their contradiction, confirmed the independence and equality of the Sees of Constantinople and Rome. All the private cases—and there were more of them than are mentioned by Mgr. P. Batiffol—do not carry any force of conviction for me. They are limited and individual, and do not at all reflect or prejudge the immutable voice of the Orthodox Church—however much they may seem to strengthen the Papal case, which, indeed, in many instances they do not. All such examples do not represent the Church and do not carry her authority, similarly as wicked, sinful Popes, or as even those who renounced the true faith, would not prejudice the Papacy, if the latter had not been declared infallible *de jure divino*—a declaration which makes important the facts that Pope Callistus is depicted by S. Hypolitus as almost an heresiarch *ex cathedra*, that Liberius signed the Semiarian creed, and that Honorius expressed himself *ex cathedra* in favour of Monotheism?

With this I have finished. I have, I think, expressed my plain mind sufficiently clearly. But I wish to add one thing. I should not like to leave an impression that I am an enemy, on principle, of every kind of Papacy or of the Papacy as it has existed throughout Christian history. That would correspond neither to my Orthodox convictions nor to my scientific knowledge. I differentiate the historical Papacy from the dogmatised Papacy. The second, of course, did not appear *ex abrupto*, and is connected with the first by some genetic succession, but for the Orthodox mind it is a hyperbolic deviation. With such a Papacy—I am saying this with the greatest regret—I do not foresee any peace, and I must characterise the Orthodox frame of mind in regard to it by the celebrated formula: *sint ut sunt*. But I accept the historic Papacy, and we Orthodox are ready to return to it. I firmly believe that, if the Papacy will forego its claims, all misunderstanding will disappear, and that even the so-called dogmatic differences will be levelled to a peaceful cohabitation. Thus, the final word lies with the Papacy, and to it I turn with the hearty appeal: *Fiat ex Occidente pax!*

EMERITUS PROFESSOR NICHOLAS GLUBOKOVSKY, D.D.
Sofia (Bulgaria) University,

1924, II, 8 (21)—Thursday.

MGR. PIERRE BATIFFOL'S REJOINER.

Si je croyais que l'échange de vues qui s'institue ici entre Bishop Gore et moi est un simple exercice de controverse et qui ne peut aboutir à aucune issue, je me recuserais d'y prendre part.

Mais je crois, au contraire, que les plus vieux sujets de controverse peuvent être révisés et tirés au clair, dans bien des cas, à condition de les aborder historiquement, quand faire se peut. Bishop Gore nous fait l'honneur de voir en France une école historique qui a usé de cette méthode. Nous avons eu Mgr. Duchesne, en effet, mais l'Angleterre a eu Lightfoot : ensemble ils professaient que le passé ne se comprend que dans le passé et par le passé. C'est à ce critérium que l'on distingue l'historien du controversiste.

IL suffisait de rappeler la défense poursuivie victorieusement par Lightfoot de l'authenticité des épîtres ignatiennes, et du même coup de la primitivité de l'épiscopat monarchique, pour signaler un des services de premier ordre rendus par l'histoire et pour montrer comment toutes les controverses ne sont pas sans issue.

Dans son édition de saint Clément, Lightfoot consacre une dissertation à la primauté de saint Pierre dans le Nouveau Testament. "Le sujet que je me propose de discuter, écrit-il, est essentiellement mêlé à la controverse, mais j'espère le traiter aussi peu que possible comme une matière de controverse. . . . Je m'y attacherai dans la limite du possible comme à une étude historique."¹

Il n'est pas impossible que Lightfoot lui-même ait passé par une sorte de *crescendo* de clairvoyance. Dans son commentaire de l'épître aux Romains de saint Ignace, il a tendance à minimiser le témoignage rendu par l'évêque d'Antioche à l'Eglise romaine. Dans son commentaire de l'épître de saint Clément, au contraire, le jugement qu'il porte sur la conscience que Rome a dès lors de sa primauté est un jugement bien remarquable. "Le langage de cette épître, écrit-il, nous permet de comprendre le secret de la croissance de la domination papale."

Lightfoot ne veut pas que l'auteur de l'épître réclame en son nom "l'autorité papale"; cette autorité est celle de l'Eglise de Rome, non de l'évêque de Rome; le nom et la personnalité de Clément ne sont pas à part de l'Eglise dont il est le porte-parole.

"Il est d'autant plus instructif d'observer le ton pressant et presque impérieux que les Romains prennent en s'adressant à leurs frères de Corinthe, dans ces dernières années du premier siècle. . . . Il peut sembler étrange de décrire cette noble remontrance comme le premier pas vers la domination papale. Et cependant, il n'y a pas de doute, c'est bien cela." Lightfoot souligne la différence

¹ J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, 1890. T. ii, p. 481.

que l'on saisit entre l'attitude de Clément à la fin du premier siècle et celle de Victor au fin du second. Mais il les rapproche avec raison. Il y a loin de là aux revendications d'un Grégoire VII, d'un Innocent III, d'un Boniface VIII, ou seulement de saint Léon, mais c'est tout de même un pas décisif. Une continuité se dessine entre le pape Clément, le pape Victor, saint Léon, la première affirmation de cette continuité se rencontrant dans cette épître romaine du dernier *décennium* du premier siècle. La primauté ecclésiastique de Rome était, non pas en germe, mais en acte. Rome parlait " comme si elle avait un droit à estimer que les conseils qu'elle donnait (aux Corinthiens) étaient dictés par le saint Esprit."

Le fait historique est là, mis en pleine lumière, et Lightfoot ne craint pas d'en montrer la portée. Tout au plus pourrait-on lui reprocher d'en avoir négligé les antécédents et d'avoir trop vite présupposé que la primauté de l'Eglise romaine était inévitable dès là que l'Eglise romaine était l'Eglise de la métropole du monde. Nous ne voyons pas, en effet, que pareille primauté se soit établie dans le judaïsme de la *diaspora*, ou dans le marcionisme, ou dans le mithraïsme. A cela près, la sollicitude et l'autorité de l'Eglise romaine se dégagent admirablement de l'examen de la *Prima Clementis* par Lightfoot, et aussi bien (peu après Lightfoot) par R. Sohm, dans le premier tome (1892) de son *Kirchenrecht*. Veut-on voir, par contraste, ce que la controverse, la mieux informée, est capable de faire dans la même occurrence? Que l'on ouvre tel livre qui veut nous dire ce que les saints primitifs ont pensé du siège de Rome, et que l'on cherche quelle place y est faite à la *Prima Clementis*, on aura la surprise de constater que l'épître est traitée par préterition.

¹ J. B. Lightfoot, *St Clement of Rome*, T. i, p. 69-70. " The language of this letter, though itself inconsistent with the possession of papal authority in the person of the writer, enables us to understand the secret of the growth of papal domination. It does not proceed from the Bishop of Rome, but from the Church of Rome. . . . The name and personality of Clement are absorbed in the Church of which he is the spokesman. This being so, it is the more instructive to observe the urgent and almost imperious tone which the Romans adopt in addressing their Corinthian brethren during the closing years of the first century. . . . It may perhaps seem strange to describe this noble remonstrance as the first step towards papal domination. And yet undoubtedly this is the case. There is all the difference in the world between the attitude of Rome towards other churches at the close of the first century, when Romans as a community remonstrate on terms of equality with the Corinthians on their irregularities, strong only in the righteousness of their cause, and feeling, as they had a right to feel, that their counsels of peace were the dictation of the Holy Spirit, and its attitude at the close of the second century, when Victor the Bishop excommunicates the Churches of Asia Minor for clinging to a usage in regard to the celebration of Easter which had been handed down to them from the Apostles, and thus fomented instead of healing dissensions. Even the second stage has carried the power of Rome only a very small step in advance towards the assumptions of a Hildebrand or an Innocent or a Boniface, or even of a Leo: but it is nevertheless a decided step. It was originally a primacy not of the episcopate but of the Church (of Rome). "

Ces exemples suffiraient, s'il était besoin, à justifier le parti pris de Lightfoot et de Duchesne de ne considérer ces vieilles questions que dans la lumière de l'histoire. "*The points in controversy are so old*," écrit Bishop Gore. C'est précisément pour cette raison qu'il nous plaît de les examiner avec une méthode plus neuve.

* * * * *

Bishop Gore a pris soin de noter qu'il y a " parmi quelques écrivains protestants, et, ajoute-t-il, parmi nous Anglicans, une plus pleine réalisation que le développement de la papauté fut pour l'Occident, en un certain sens, *providentiel*, alors même que le dessein de la Providence ait été, ça et là, trahi par ses instruments humains."

Cette observation de Bishop Gore ne doit pas passer inaperçue, car elle signale un déplacement des lignes des vieilles controverses. La papauté, si elle est quelque chose de providentiel, ne peut plus être éconduite brutalement comme elle l'était jadis. Elle ne peut pas ne pas être prise en considération. Le catholicisme ne se conçoit pas sans elle. Et qu'il se rencontre des Anglicans pour le dire, c'est là un fait nouveau et d'une importance considérable. Mais on ne voit pas que Bishop Gore se rallie sans réserve à ces Anglicans. Il reste absolument réfractaire au " système papal," loin d'y voir rien de réellement providentiel, rien de désirable. La papauté ne peut être pour lui qu'une déformation de la constitution première du catholicisme, une usurpation de l'évêque de Rome sur l'autonomie des évêques dans la *Catholica*, une intrusion destinée à se muer en *imperium* et à rompre l'équilibre de l'unité de l'Eglise. Le système papal s'est développé en Occident " pour une large part à l'aide de faux documents, mais aussi sous la pression du besoin humain dans lequel nous devons voir un dessein providentiel." Déconcertante contradiction, la papauté fausse le catholicisme, elle est le produit du besoin humain qu'on avait d'elle, ce besoin lui-même est un besoin providentiel, servi à l'occasion par de faux documents comme peuvent être la donation de Constantin ou les fausses décrétales ! Quel "*providential purpose*" est-ce là ! Au fond, la pensée de Bishop Gore sur la papauté et son rôle déformant ne diffère pas de la pensée de Dollinger, à cela près que Bishop Gore y met infiniment plus de mesure et de sérénité que Janus, mais le radicalisme est le même.

• Nous voudrions, dans les pages qui vont suivre, montrer les points faibles de la doctrine de Bishop Gore.

I.

" Nous ne pouvons," écrit Bishop Gore, " nous dérober à la controverse sur le terrain scripturaire. Rome s'est donné l'avantage de capter

¹ Déjà en 1905, Dom Chapman, *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims*, p. 84, relevait cette contradiction.

l'imagination par sa grandiose interprétation du *Tu es Petrus*. En réalité, le reste du Nouveau Testament, quand on l'examine avec soin, spécialement les épîtres de saint Paul et de saint Pierre, 'constitue un formidable obstacle à l'interprétation papale' du *Tu es Petrus*. "Rien, en effet, énonce Bishop Gore, ne me semble être plus certain que saint Paul ne reconnaissait pas d'autorité spirituelle sur terre supérieure à celle des apôtres (autorité dont il était si pleinement conscient en lui-même), et qu'il n'admettait pas de réelle différence de dignité ou d'office entre les apôtres."

Que saint Paul n'admette pas de réelle différence de dignité ou d'office entre les apôtres, il faut pour se le persuader oublier l'épître aux Galates, où saint Paul nous raconte comment, trois ans après sa conversion, il monta à Jérusalem "pour faire la connaissance de Céphas," et demeura "quinze jours auprès de lui sans voir aucun des autres apôtres si ce n'est Jacques, frère du Seigneur" (Gal. I, 18-19).

Quatorze ans plus tard, Paul monte de nouveau à Jérusalem : il va exposer "l'Evangile qu'il prêche parmi les Gentils," d'abord "à toute la communauté des saints de Jérusalem," puis "à ceux qui paraissent être quelque chose pour s'assurer de ne pas courir ou de n'avoir pas couru pour rien" (II, 2). Paul a résisté aux "faux frères" qui s'étaient insinués dans les communautés établies par lui et voulaient y imposer la circoncision. Son autorité ne réussit pas à avoir raison de ces "faux frères," il est amené à venir soumettre le cas à Jérusalem, et là finalement "Jacques, Céphas et Jean, qui sont regardés comme des colonnes," dit-il, "nous donnèrent la main, à Barnabé et à moi, pour aller, nous aux païens, eux aux circoncis" (II, 9). Sans doute Pierre est mis ici sur le même rang que Jacques et Jean, et encore n'est-il nommé qu'après Jacques, d'où l'on pourrait inférer qu'il n'est pas une autorité qui serait unique. Mais dans ce même passage, ces mêmes colonnes "reconnaissent que l'Evangile," écrit Paul, "m'a été confié pour les incirconcis, comme à Pierre pour les circoncis, car celui qui a fait Pierre l'apôtre des circoncis m'a fait l'apôtre des Gentils" (II, 7, 8).

Ainsi, à Jérusalem, il y a les saints, c'est-à-dire toute la communauté primitive ; dans cette communauté, il y a ceux qui sont regardés comme des colonnes, Jacques, Céphas, Jean, et qui confirment l'Evangile de Paul ; entre ces colonnes, il y a Céphas "en qui Dieu a opéré pour l'apostolat de la circoncision," comme il a opéré en Paul pour l'apostolat des Gentils (II, 8) ; et les colonnes prennent acte que l'Evangile a été confié à Paul pour les Gentils "comme à Céphas pour les circoncis" (II, 7).

Les Gentils confiés à Paul, les circoncis confiés à Pierre, et aussi

¹ Pour l'exégèse de ces textes, je renverrai au P. Lagrange, *Epître aux Galates* (1918).

bien aux autres colonnes (II, 9), voilà bien entre les apôtres une réelle différence d'office. D'autre part, Céphas, plus en relief que Jacques et Jean, Céphas apôtre itinérant comme Paul et tenant à l'égard des convertis de la circoncision une place comparable à celle que l'on reconnaît à Paul à l'égard des convertis de la gentilité, voilà bien une réelle différence, si non de dignité, au moins d'importance, pour Pierre entre les colonnes.

Disons que Pierre est, de l'aveu même de Paul, une autorité exceptionnelle. Il est une autorité que, dans une Eglise comme celle de Corinthe, Paul invoque (I Cor., IX, 9 ; XV, 5). Il est connu à Corinthe, où cependant il n'a jamais paru, si bien que, la communauté en discorde se réclamant, qui de Paul, qui d'Apollos, qui du Christ, il se trouve des fidèles pour se réclamer de Céphas (I, 12).¹ Ces faits ne sont pas négligeables à un historien qui cherche les indices d'une différence entre Pierre et les autres apôtres.

On nous dira : Des fidèles se rencontraient, à Corinthe même, qui se réclamaient de Céphas, soit ; mais Paul avait conscience que son apostolat, qui faisait de lui l'apôtre de Jésus-Christ encore que "le plus petit de tous les saints" (Eph. III, 8), ne l'assujettissait pas à Céphas. Paul se donne aux Eglises par lui fondées comme la seule autorité qu'elles doivent recevoir : il entend que ces Eglises relèvent de lui directement, constamment, si bien que sur lui pèse vraiment "la sollicitude de toutes les Eglises" (II Cor. XI, 28), de toutes les Eglises nées de son apostolat. Je réponds : ce régime où l'apôtre est l'autorité souveraine ne peut représenter qu'une économie provisoire.

Dans l'épître aux Ephésiens (II, 20), Paul élargit ses vues, il écrit à ses convertis d'Asie : "Vous avez été bâtis sur le fondement des apôtres et des prophètes, la pierre angulaire étant Jésus-Christ lui-même." Pour ces convertis d'Asie, qui sont des chrétiens venus de la gentilité, il y a une autre autorité que celle de Paul : il y a les apôtres. Davantage : il y a les prophètes, que l'esprit saint suscite dans les communautés chrétiennes. Davantage : il y a les évangélistes, les pasteurs, les didascales (IV, 11). Tous travaillent "à l'édification du corps du Christ" qui est l'Eglise. Dans l'unité de ce corps, le Christ, "qui est notre paix, des deux peuples n'en a fait qu'un" (II, 14). Des chrétiens incirconcis ne sont plus des étrangers, ils sont "concitoyens des saints et membres de la famille de Dieu" (II, 19). L'Eglise, corps mystique du Christ et société des saints, a son unité dans le Christ : elle a été propagée dans le monde par la parole des apôtres et des prophètes, et déjà apôtres et prophètes

¹ W. Bousset, sur I Cor. I, 12, dans le N. T. de J. Weiss, t. II (1908), p. 76 : "Schwerer ist es zu erklären, wie in Korinth eine Kephas (Petrus) Partei zu Stande gekommen." Il propose de dire que Pierre est venu à Corinthe, mais cette hypothèse est à écarter. C. Weizsäcker, *Apostol, Zeitalter*, p. 275.

sont au terme de leur œuvre, Paul est prisonnier à Rome, l'édification du corps du Christ passe aux évangélistes, aux pasteurs, aux didascales. Ici encore la description de l'Eglise, pour autant que l'Eglise n'est pas seulement le corps mystique du Christ, décrit une économie provisoire.¹

Car le jour est proche où les prophètes seront "évacués," et parmi les évangélistes, pasteurs, didascales, mentionnés par l'épître aux Ephésiens, se forme un ministère dans lequel toute autorité s'absorbera, celui des évêques, dont l'épître aux Ephésiens ne dit pas un mot. Bishop Gore nous assure que les épîtres de saint Paul constituent un formidable obstacle à l'interprétation papale du *Tu es Petrus* : on pourrait dire aussi bien qu'elles sont un formidable obstacle à l'authenticité paulinienne des épîtres pastorales et à l'institution de l'épiscopat monarchique.²

L'âge apostolique est aux yeux de l'historien tout plein d'économies provisoires : il ne s'est établi que par des préparations successives dans les institutions qui réalisaient le catholicisme et qui ont ensuite traversé les siècles, l'épiscopat par exemple : des régimes transitoires, éphémères, se sont résorbés, par exemple, celui des ministères charismatiques ou itinérants. Le partage de l'apostolat entre l'épiscopat de la gentilité et celui des circoncis n'a eu qu'un temps : la première épître de saint Pierre est adressée à des chrétiens qui sont des convertis de la gentilité.³ Si, un temps, Pierre a pu être considéré comme l'apôtre de la circoncision et Paul comme l'apôtre de la gentilité, à l'heure où s'écrit la *Prima Petri*, ce partage de l'apostolat est dépassé : Pierre, "apôtre de Jésus-Christ," s'adresse aux chrétiens dispersés dans le Pont, la Galatie, la Cappadoce, l'Asie et la Bithynie. Il ne se donne certes pas l'apparence d'une autorité unique et souveraine ; mais Bishop Gore ne fera pas, j'espère, à l'apôtre un grief de sa modestie, de sa volonté d'être un serviteur des serviteurs de Dieu, de ne pas se poser en dominateur des Eglises. Et quand la *Prima*

¹ F. Prat, *La Théologie de Saint Paul*, T. II (1912), p. 429-430 : "Les chrétientés fondées par Paul restaient toujours sous sa tutelle. Aucune n'eut de son vivant une organisation autonome. . . . On peut se demander si cette centralisation excessive ne retarda pas l'organisation monarchique dans les fondations pauliniennes, et si ces dernières jouèrent le rôle que semblaient leur assigner leur importance locale et leur origine apostolique. . . . En étudiant l'évolution de la hiérarchie dans les Eglises fondées par saint Paul, on doit s'attendre à rencontrer un système moins uniforme et une période de tâtonnements plus longue. Ce n'est pas à dire que ces Eglises fussent privées de tout gouvernement propre."

² Dom Chapman, *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims*, p. 94, "Obviously the government of the Church by monarchical Bishops cannot be directly proved from Holy Scripture ; it rests upon tradition." Bishop Henson en prend prétexte pour argumenter contre le droit divin de l'épiscopat historique, comme fait Bishop Gore contre le droit divin de la papauté ! Voyez H. Henson, *Cross-Bench Views of current Church Questions* (1902), p. 394.

³ A. Jülicher, *Einleitung* (1906), p. 177.

Petri ne serait pas authentique, quitte à être cependant antérieure à la *Prima Clementis* (l'hypothèse est de M. Harnack), nous tiendrions avec elle un indice de l'autorité attribuée à Pierre, et s'exerçant de Rome, où il est supposé séjourner, sur les lointaines chrétientés d'Asie, de Galatie, de Cappadoce, où s'était exercé naguère l'apostolat de Paul.

II.

Les théologiens catholiques, depuis le concile du Vatican qui a consacré le mot de développement et en a revêtu le principe de la formule de Vincent de Lérins, ont étudié à maintes reprises la notion du développement des dogmes, ils ont même poussé la théorie sensiblement au delà de la formule élémentaire du *Commonitorium*. Bishop Gore me demande d'exposer ma pensée sur le développement : je n'en ai pas d'autre que les *probati auctores* de mon Eglise auxquels il me suffit de le renvoyer.¹ Historien, je me tiens modestement aux faits, à l'observation des faits, à la vérification des faits, et je m'attache ici au fait de la papauté antique.²

Bishop Gore qui a mis tant de science et de persévérance à défendre le fait de l'épiscopat primitif, dans son livre magistral, *The Church and the Ministry*, ne m'en voudra pas de m'attrister qu'il n'ait pas appliqué les mêmes qualités à examiner le fait de la papauté primitive. Il se borne à renvoyer avec "consolation" ses lecteurs à ce *Papalism* de Denny que M. Foakes Jackson, dans son *Introduction to the History of Christianity* (1921), juge en deux mots : "Very hostile." L'attitude de Bishop Gore est, elle aussi, celle de l'hostilité.

"Il est clair comme le jour," écrit-il, "que l'Orient n'a pas l'idée d'une autorité centrale divinement instituée." Aux yeux du Dr Gore, la papauté est une institution fondée sur une doctrine qui s'est pleinement épanouie à Rome, au V^e siècle, et qui n'a pas été dès lors contestée en Occident. Mais cette doctrine ne fait point partie de la *tradition apostolique* dont Origène détaille les éléments, et dont se sont réclamés, soit les pères grecs en Orient, soit Irénée ou Tertullien en Occident. Cette doctrine est inconciliable avec la théorie et la pratique de Cyprien.

Voilà la thèse de Bishop Gore, très nette, très radicale.

Que la doctrine de la papauté ait trouvé à Rome sa pleine expression sous la plume du pape Innocent ou du pape Léon, je le veux bien ; qu'elle n'ait pas trouvé auparavant son expression sous la plume de

¹ Voyez l'article du P. Pinard, "Dogme," du *Dictionnaire apoloétique* de D'Alès, T. I (1911), p. 1151-84. Voyez encore l'article du P. Gardey sur les deux livres récents du P. Schultes et du P. Sola, dans la *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 1924, p. 576-90.

² Ai-je même besoin de rappeler que le mot *Papatus* n'appartient pas à la langue ecclésiastique des premiers dix siècles ?

papes comme Damase ou Sirice, je le conteste. Mais bien avant d'être une doctrine épanouie, la papauté était un fait, qui se manifestait, (1) dans la sollicitude que l'Eglise romaine avait pour toutes les Eglises, (2) dans l'autorité que lui donnait le dépôt de la foi apostolique que l'on était sûr de trouver chez elle, (3) dans le pouvoir qu'on lui reconnaissait de corriger à l'occasion les autres Eglises.¹ Cette triple prérogative eût été une prétention insupportable, si elle n'avait pas été justifiée par une économie que l'on tenait pour apostolique et divine.

"Cette doctrine," insiste Bishop Gore, "ne fait point partie de la *tradition apostolique* telle qu'elle l'expose Origène." Soit, mais il ne faut point oublier que cette *tradition apostolique* n'a pas trait aux institutions. Irénée qui a écrit une *Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*, n'y fait aucune place aux institutions. Le symbole baptismal de Rome mentionne l'Eglise, la sainte Eglise, mais il n'estime pas nécessaire de mentionner l'épiscopat, qui est pourtant apostolique d'institution et sans lequel l'Eglise ne subsisterait pas. Origène, par ailleurs, n'ignorait pas l'Eglise romaine, cette Eglise qu'il appelait "la très-vieille Eglise des Romains," et qu'il tint à visiter. Pourquoi ce Grec tenait-il à visiter "la très-vieille Eglise des Romains"? Parce que, répondrons-nous, l'Eglise romaine était contemplée en Orient comme le domicile des apôtres, et comme "ayant été depuis l'origine la métropole de la religion," ainsi que dira le concile d'Antioche de 340. Elle était, au III^e siècle, en dépit même des résistances qu'on lui opposait parfois, l'Eglise sur laquelle on finissait toujours par se régler. C'est Rome qui a voulu la conformité sur la date de Pâques au temps du pape Victor : des résistances se sont produites très vives en Asie où l'on était quartodécimant : Rome, par charité, n'a pas rompu avec les réfractaires, mais la conformité s'est établie sans qu'on sache quand, paisiblement, silencieusement, et le concile de Nicée a trouvé la question de la Pâque résolue, loin qu'il ait eu à la résoudre. C'est Rome qui a fait valoir la validité du baptême des hérétiques : ici encore des résistances se sont produites en

¹ H. M. Gwatkin, *Early Church History* (1909), t. I, p. 213-4, a une belle page que je veux citer. "(The Church of Rome) was the centre of Christendom as a whole. Its central position was fully recognised by Irenæus, and became more and more definite as time went on till the rise of Constantinople. . . . Rome was the natural link of East and West. As a Greek colony in the Latin capital, it was the representative of Western Christianity to the Easterns, and the interpreter of Eastern thought to the Latin West. For all these reasons Rome was the natural centre of discussion. Her Orthodoxy was unstained. Whatever heresies, like the Eastern Orontes, might flow to the great city, no heresy ever issued thence. The strangers of every land who found their way to Rome and the tombs of the great apostles, were welcomed from St. Peter's Throne with the majestic blessing of a universal father. *The Church of God which sojourneth in Rome* was the immemorial counsellor of all the churches; and the voice of counsel slowly passed into that of command."

Afrique, en Orient, et l'on connaît les éclats de Cyprien et de Firmilien: Rome encore n'a pas usé de rigueur, mais la conformité s'est faite ensuite si bien que saint Augustin n'imaginera pas qu'elle ait pu être procurée autrement que par un concile universel. Rome y avait suffi par son influence, et l'Afrique avait en fin de compte donné tort à Cyprien.

Je sais bien que des critiques comme M. Harnack ne voient dans cette influence universelle de l'Eglise romaine, encore vers 290, qu'une primauté de services rendus: "Un fondement dogmatique ou historique, clairement connu, manquait encore, écrit-il, du moins selon toutes les vraisemblances, il était encore à Rome incertain." M. Harnack écrivait cela en 1892: depuis lors, dans le mémoire qu'il a donné en 1918 sur le *Tu es Petrus* et où il a voulu montrer que le *Super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam* était une interpolation tendancieuse, il a émis l'hypothèse que ce faux avait dû être commis au bénéfice de l'Eglise romaine et à Rome même, à l'époque d'Hadrien.¹ Le fondement de droit divin de la primauté avait donc été posé à Rome dès les premiers *decennia* du second siècle!

Laissons-là ces conjectures et tenons-nous au texte d'Irénée sur la *potior principalitas* de l'Eglise romaine. Irénée veut que toutes les Eglises se rallient à l'Eglise de Rome comme au plus sûr dépôt de la foi apostolique, et parce qu'elle est l'Eglise *principalis*, c'est-à-dire l'Eglise aînée, l'Eglise établie en la personne de Pierre le jour où le Christ prononce le *Tu es Petrus*, l'Eglise dont toutes les autres ne sont que les puînées. La justification de l'autorité centrale reconnue à l'Eglise romaine est dans le dépôt de la foi qu'elle conserve et dans la *principalitas* qu'elle tient de Pierre. C'est Irénée qui dit cela, et Irénée est un Grec. Victor, qui est évêque de Rome, contemporain et ami d'Irénée, est pénétré de la sollicitude de toutes les Eglises, son action dans la controverse pascale l'atteste assez, car son action s'étend à toutes les Eglises d'Orient, de l'Egypte à l'Asie, qu'il entend rallier à la même date pascale, et son action est assez énergique pour que Renan put en dire: "La papauté était déjà née."² Ces faits qui se relient les uns aux autres (nous pourrions en aligner d'autres encore),³ infirment donc la thèse de Bishop Gore, et ils soutiennent seuls une histoire des origines du catholicisme. Les évêques n'auraient eu à rendre compte qu'à Dieu chacun de leur administration, comme le prétendait si indûment saint Cyprien, l'isolement des Eglises aurait été la loi de l'Eglise: on aurait eu un

¹ Voyez mon *Eglise Naissante* (ed. de 1922), p. 113.

² Renan, *Marc Aurèle*, p. 201.

³ M. d'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, T. II (1921), p. 152-172.

numerus episcoporum, on n'aurait pas eu un *corpus-totius Ecclesiae*.¹ L'unité visible de l'Eglise a été faite par une unité constituée, qui avait pour elle une autorité que les Eglises dispersées ne récusait pas, à laquelle elles recouraient plutôt : cette unité était l'Eglise romaine. Les historiens, comme M. Harnack, qui se sont appliqués à résoudre le problème des origines du catholicisme, ont le mérite d'avoir montré que "qui dit catholique, dit romain." M. Kattenbusch a fait valoir que la règle de foi, en laquelle toute la catholicité s'est unie, est issue de Rome et adéquate au symbole baptismal romain. M. Sohm a pensé établir que l'épiscopat monarchique a été emprunté à Rome par le reste de la catholicité, et avec l'épiscopat monarchique le germe de tout le *Kirchenrecht*. Le même Sohm n'a pas craint d'écrire que les grandes questions ecclésiastiques qui se sont posées au II^e et au III^e siècle "ont trouvé leur solution pour l'Eglise à Rome"; que "Rome est la tête de l'Eglise et que sans elle l'Eglise n'est plus l'Eglise"; que "c'est seulement par leur union avec Rome que les communautés particulières appartiennent à l'Eglise"; que "ces persuasions de l'ancienne Eglise catholique du II^e et du III^e siècle rendent seules compte de la prodigieuse puissance de la communauté romaine en face de toutes les autres communautés." Je ne puis que regretter que l'érudition de Bishop Gore ait été jusqu'ici impénétrable à ces vues classiques aujourd'hui chez les historiens.

III.

On inférera de l'exposé qui précède que, dès le II^e et le III^e siècle, la "papauté" était dans les faits, qu'elle était dans la conscience de l'Eglise romaine, qu'elle était acceptée non moins consciemment par un saint Irénée : nous avons essayé de fixer les traits auxquels se reconnaît cette papauté primitive, et nous avons pressenti la part qui fut la sienne dans la formation du catholicisme. Il nous reste à examiner quelques preuves que Bishop Gore croit devoir appeler à son aide pour établir que "la suprématie du pape *jure divino* est un développement occidental, et qu'en le rejetant les Orientaux n'ont rien rejeté qu'ils eussent cru antérieurement."

¹ Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 308 : "True, Cyprian's whole theory of the Church implied the equality of Bishops, and he utterly disavows for himself as well as others any *tyrannical* claim to authority by one Bishop over another. But even Cyprian could not stay the drift of time." Encore n'est-il que juste de signaler la contradiction intime de la doctrine de Cyprien. Voyez Dom Chapman, *Professor Hugh Koch on Cyprian*, *Revue Bénédictine*, 1910, op. 462. A. d'Alès, *La Théologie de S. Cyprien* (1922), p. 218-223.

² R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, T. I (1892), p. 382-3.

A cette assertion nous opposons, et c'est une réponse classique,¹ que le concile de Chalcédoine a accepté cette primauté du pape *jure divino*. A Chalcédoine, en effet, dès l'ouverture du concile, les pères ont accepté que les légats de S. Léon qualifiasent l'évêque de Rome de "*caput omnium Ecclesiarum*." Le concile fini, ils ont écrit à S. Léon, le remerciant d'avoir été pour tous "l'interprète de la voix du bienheureux Pierre," et d'avoir à tous "procuré la bénédiction de sa foi." Ils insistent : Nous étions là environ cinq cent vingt évêques "que tu conduisais comme la tête conduit les membres." Le malheureux Dioscore "avait visé dans sa folie celui à qui le Sauveur a confié la garde de la vigne, nous voulons dire ta sainteté, et il avait voulu excommunier celui qui a pour mission d'unir le corps de l'Eglise."² La pensée de pères de Chalcédoine ne contredit pas la doctrine de S. Léon sur sa propre suprématie de droit divin, elle la confirme.

Mais il y a le 28^e canon de Chalcédoine.

Ce canon est l'œuvre du quatrième concile œcuménique, à la suite du second concile œcuménique, énonce Bishop Gore. Le qualificatif d'œcuménique ne doit pas nous en imposer ici : les canons ne sont jamais œcuméniques au sens où les définitions de foi le sont.³ Les canons de 381 et de 451 sont œcuméniques en tant qu'ils sont l'œuvre des évêques orientaux en concile : ils sont une expression du droit oriental. Cela est si vrai, que le pape S. Léon peut déclarer⁴ qu'il n'a jamais eu connaissance du troisième canon de 381.

Le 28^e canon de Chalcédoine a été voté dans une session à laquelle les légats n'assistaient point. Mais les légats se sont immédiatement inquiétés de ce canon, dans lequel ils ont vu un attentat aux "règles canoniques" et une "humiliation du Siège apostolique" ; ils ont déclaré en référer à "l'évêque apostolique qui est le premier de toute l'Eglise" pour qu'il puisse juger de l'injure faite à son siège et de la violation des canons.⁵ Si les pères du concile avaient été dans les sentiments que leur prête Bishop Gore, ils auraient dû maintenir leur canon, comme ils semblent en avoir eu un moment l'intention,⁶ et donc passer outre aux sommations des légats ! Ils

¹ Les *Echos d'Orient*, 1924, p. 246, m'apprennent que cet argument a été déjà présenté dans un livre de J. L. Lucchesini, *Sacra monarchia S. Leonis . . . fulgens in polemica historia Concilii Chalcedonen is* (Rome, 1693), dédiée à Innocent XII. L'argument est repris par M. d'Herbigny, *op. cit.* p. 119-152.

² Voyez mon *Siège apostolique* (1924), pp. 538, 562.

³ Duchesne, *Hist. anc.*, T. I, p. 152, parlant des canons de Nicée, y voit une "législation sans caractère synthétique, toute de circonstance, comme fut toujours la législation des conciles représentant non point la réglementation générale des rapports ecclésiastiques, mais simplement la solution d'un certain nombre de cas sur lesquels l'attention des membres de l'assemblée se trouvait avoir été appelée."

⁴ *Siège Apostolique*, pp. 559-560, 572.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 561-2. ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 562.

ne l'ont pas fait. Ils ont, au contraire, écrit au pape S. Léon, le priant de confirmer leur canon, déclarant qu'ils attendent de lui que, de même qu'ils se sont sur la foi accordés avec lui qui est la tête, il consentira aux enfants ce qui convient, lui qui est κορυφή, le sommet de l'Eglise.¹

Ce ne sont là que des mots, énonce Bishop Gore, et pure affaire de cérémonie ! Car, poursuit-il, "le langage dans lequel la préséance de Rome est reconnu par le 28^e canon est tout à fait incompatible avec la conception d'un *jus divinum* inhérent au siège."

En effet, le 28^e canon énonce que "les pères ont à bon droit reconnu la primauté (τὰ πρεσβεῖα) au trône de la vieille Rome, parce que cette ville est souveraine (διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην)."² Le canon ne dit pas quels sont ces pères. Il ajoute : "Mais par la même considération, les cent cinquante théophiles évêques (du concile de 381) ont attribué³ la même primauté (τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα) au très-saint trône de la nouvelle Rome, estimant avec raison que la ville qui est honorée de la présence du basileus et du sénat, et qui a les mêmes privilèges (πρεσβεῖα) que la vieille Rome royale, est grande aussi comme elle dans les choses ecclésiastiques, étant la seconde après elle." Ainsi deux Romes, toutes deux possédant les mêmes privilèges civils, toutes deux allant de pair comme les deux empereurs, à cela près qu'il y a une vieille Rome et une nouvelle Rome : donc parité des deux sièges, à cela près que celui de Rome est le premier et celui de Constantinople le second. Pas un mot du privilège apostolique de Rome.

Donc, conclut Bishop Gore, le 28^e canon de Chalcédoine nie le privilège apostolique du siège de Rome. Cette conclusion n'est pas nouvelle, et je ne dis pas qu'elle ne soit pas logique, mais je conteste qu'elle soit dans la perspective des rédacteurs du dit canon. J'ai deux raisons à faire valoir à l'appui.

I. Nous avons dans la lettre CVII de Saint Léon la preuve que l'homme de sa confiance à Constantinople, Julien, évêque de Kos, lui a écrit pour recommander la requête d'Anatolios en faveur du 28^e canon. Supposons que la requête d'Anatolios soit un prodige de duplicité et qu'elle aille à faire approuver par le pape la négation sournoise du privilège apostolique du siège de Rome, et cette supposition est une énormité ; à qui fera-t-on croire que Julien de Kos n'ait pas soupçonné la négation ainsi impliquée dans le 28^e canon ? Le pape répond à Julien de Kos (22 mai), que ni ses raisons, ni ses supplica-

¹ Ibid., p. 563-4.

² Les pères ont reconnu, ἀποδίδωσι. Dom Chapman, note (p. 86 de sa réponse aux *Cath. Claims*) : "Ἀποδίδωμι does not mean *I give a present*, but *I return a loan*, or *I render a due*."—Bishop G. and the *Cath. Claims* (1909), p. 86.

³ Ici ἀπέριμαν.

tions, ne l'induiront à approuver le 28^e canon : "*Nulla modo poteris obtinere a me in excidium ecclesiastici status vel suadendo impellas vel supplicando traducas.*" Qu' Anatolios n'espère pas que j'accorderai, ajoute le pape, ce qu'il demande, au mépris des canons des pères (de Nicée), quelles que soient les intercessions qui l'appuieront auprès de moi : "*Nullis apud me patrocinis ita poterit adiuvare, ut his quae postulat calcata patrum constitutione consentiam.*"¹

II. Julien de Kos donc n'a pas soupçonné la négation dénoncée par Bishop Gore dans le 28^e canon ; mais voici qui est plus péremptoire, le pape S. Léon ne l'a ni dénoncée, ni soupçonnée. Il dit à Julien de Kos, dans la lettre CVII : " Ta dilection a pu voir à maintes reprises avec quelle constance, avec quelle décision, j'entends maintenir les statuts des saints canons de Nicée, parce que j'estime que toutes les règles ecclésiastiques sont compromises, si en quelque chose est violée cette sacrosainte constitution des pères." Dans le 28^e canon S. Léon voit l'ambition de l'évêque de Constantinople, qui cherche à s'attribuer des pouvoirs illicites aux dépens de l'universalité *Ecclesiae status saluberrima olim et vera ordinatione munitus*. Le pape Léon n'a pas un mot qui donne à penser que le privilège apostolique de Rome soit menacé.² La lettre CVII à Julien n'est pas la seule que le pape écrive sur cette affaire. Il y a la lettre CIV à l'empereur Marcien, la lettre CV à l'impératrice Pulchérie, la lettre CVI à l'évêque de Constantinople Anatolios, toutes les trois du même jour que la lettre CVII. Dans ces lettres le pape s'élève contre l'ambition d'Anatolios et contre le 28^e canon qu'il repousse absolument. Il reproche à ce 28^e canon de renverser l'ordre établi par les pères de Nicée : ici encore pas un mot qui suggère que le pape ait à défendre son privilège apostolique. Le pape défend "*statuta paternorum canonum quae ante longissimae aetatis annos in urbe Nicaena spiritualibus sunt fundata decretis*" (Epist. CV, 2), les "*sacratissimas Nicaenorum canonum constitutiones*," qui assurent au siège d'Alexandrie le "*secundi honoris privilegium*" et au siège d'Antioche "*proprietaem tertiae dignitatis*" (Epist. CVI, 2). Il ne parle pas du

¹ Sans doute les légats du pape à Chalcedoine ont tout de suite vu dans le 28^e canon une injure faite au siège apostolique. Mais ils ne sont trop échauffés apparemment, puisque Julien de Kos ne partage pas leur sentiment.

² Chapman, *op. cit.*, p. 27 : " It is certain that St. Leo saw in the canon nothing in any way reflecting upon the unique dignity that he himself claimed with so much assurance. He does not see anything in the canon inconsistent with the respect due to Rome." B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A. D. 461*, T. II (1922), p. 337-338. " Leo, it will be observed does not appeal to the principle of Papalism in order to get the canon cancelled. He only appeals to Eastern veneration for the Council of Nicaea." On pourrait supposer une erreur chez S. Léon, si Julien de Kos n'avait pas estimé de son côté le canon parfaitement conciliable avec les principes du papalisme.

premier rang du siège de Rome, ce premier rang n'étant pas contesté à Constantinople. La lettre CXIV (21 Mart. 453) est la lettre par laquelle le pape S. Léon écrit aux évêques qui ont tenu le concile de Chalcédoine ; il approuve ce qu'ils ont décidé sur la foi ; mais il rejette ce qu'ils ont proposé dans leur 28^e canon et qui va contre les inviolables décrets de Nicée : "*Jura Ecclesiarum sicut ab illis CCCXVIII patribus divinitus inspiratis sunt ordinata permancant*" (Epist. CXIV, 2). Il écrit le même jour à Marcien : "*Privilegia Ecclesiarum illibata permancant*" (Epist. CXV, 17).

Ainsi le pape S. Léon n'a pas relevé dans le 28^e canon, et pas davantage Julien de Kos, ce que Bishop Gore y voit. Le pape n'a pas repoussé la formule : "Les pères ont à bon droit reconnu la primauté au trône de la vieille Rome, parce que cette ville est souveraine."¹ La raison en est, peut-on croire, que cette primauté (τὰ πρεσβεία) ne visait pas le privilège apostolique ; cette primauté répondait à la conception que l'on se faisait dans le monde romain de l'*ordo urbium*, et à l'importance qu'on y attachait. "Nous devons," écrit Galla Placidia à Pulchérie au lendemain du brigandage d'Ephèse, "attribuer le *primatus* en tout à la ville éternelle, qui a rempli le monde entier de la domination de sa *virtus*, et a donné à notre empire l'univers à gouverner et à conserver." Voilà bien le langage du temps. Mais Galla Placidia n'ignore pas pour autant le privilège "*apostolicæ sedis in qua primus apostolorum beatus Petrus, qui etiam claves regnorum cælestium suscipiens, sacerdotii principatum tenuit*."² Le 28^e canon Chalcédoine n'a pensé qu'à l'*ordo urbium* : le pape S. Léon n'a pas vu dans ce que ce canon dit du *primatus* de la vieille Rome une négation du *principatus* du siège apostolique.³ Nous ne saurions être sur ce point plus chatouilleux que le pape.

Saint Léon défend contre l'évêque de Constantinople l'*universalis Ecclesiæ status* qu'il croit trouver dans le sixième canon de Nicée, et qui, réservant au siège de Rome le premier rang, attribue le second à Alexandrie, le troisième à Antioche. Anatolios réclame pour le siège de Constantinople la parité avec le siège de Rome, mais la parité en second : c'est la une prétention qui doit remonter au temps de Théodose. La doctrine que lui oppose S. Léon est plus nouvelle, elle apparaît pour la première fois en 422, sous le pape Boniface

¹ Cette formule sera relevée, au contraire, dans le *Nomocanon* de S. Méthode, où on lit : "il n'est pas vrai, comme affirme ce canon, que les saints pères ont accordé la primauté à l'ancienne Rome, parcequ'elle était la capitale de l'empire, mais c'est d'en haut, c'est de la grace divine que cette primauté a tiré son origine. . . ." Tout le texte, traduit de slavon, dans B. Leit, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance* (1924), p. 38-9.

² Inter s. Leon., Epist. LVIII.

³ Chapman, *op. cit.*, p. 87 : "The fathers of Chalcedon had no idea that their doctrine of the coincidence of ecclesiastical with secular jurisdiction could be in any way contrary to the prerogatives of Rome as the Apostolic See."

et nous ne ferons pas difficulté de reconnaître qu'elle est une interprétation arbitraire du sixième canon de Nicée, lequel n'a pas pensé à fixer ou à reconnaître un *ordo urbium*. L'empereur Justinien, dans sa *Novellæ* CXXXI, confirmera la prétention du siège de Constantinople, et Rome un jour l'acceptera sans hésitation.¹ S. Léon aurait pu l'accepter tout de suite sans plus d'hésitation qu' Eugène IV : en confirmant le 28^e canon de Chalcédoine, il aurait certes encouragé l'ambition de l'évêque de Constantinople, et c'était un grave danger, mais il n'aurait rien sacrifié du privilège apostolique du siège de Rome.

IV

Il me reste à répondre à trois arguments subsidiaires de Bishop Gore. J'ai fait état des appels adressés par des évêques orientaux à Rome et je suis heureux de constater que Bishop Gore ne conteste pas le fait. Il observe seulement que ces appels n'impliquent pas nécessairement la reconnaissance d'une autorité de droit divin dans l'Eglise romaine. C'est entendu. Je remarque cependant que le concile de Sardique² qui le premier s'est prononcé sur les appels déclare " vouloir honorer la mémoire du bienheureux apôtre Pierre." Je remarque encore que le siège de Rome est le seul auquel on ait persévéramment fait appel, comme si les autres sièges, si glorieux fussent-ils, n'eussent rien qui attirât les appelants ou qui leur assurât une sentence définitive.

J'ai fait état de l'acceptation par l'épiscopat oriental de la formule du pape Hormisdas, de 515. La formule, en effet, est reproduite textuellement dans la lettre *Redditis mihi* (28 mars 519) de l'évêque de Constantinople Jean annonçant au pape Hormisdas sa soumission.³ Bishop Gore accuse Jean d'être un pauvre homme, " *a poor weak man*," qui a accepté toutes les conditions imposées par le pape Hormisdas et par l'empereur Justin : ceci rend déjà invraisemblable qu'il ait par son préambule vidé la formule de la signification que Rome lui donnait. Mais, en fait, cette préface n'affecte pas la formule et affirme l'union que Jean déclare vouloir entre son siège et Rome.⁴

¹ *Siège Apostolique*, p. 577. Kidd, *op. cit.*, T. iii, p. 336.

² Le concile de Rome de 485 écrira que les pères de Nicée (Nicée = Sardique) " confirmationem rerum atque auctoritatem sanctae romanae Ecclesiae detulerunt, quae utraque usque ad aetatem nostram successiones omnes Christi gratia praestante custodiunt." *Collect. Avellan*, 70 (ed. Guenther, p. 159). Je compte publier dans la *Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique* de Louvain une mémoire sur les recours d'Orient à Rome antérieurs au concile de Chalcédoine.

³ *Collect. Avellan*, 159 (p. 607).

⁴ " Ecclesias, id est superioris vestrae et novellae istius Romae, unam esse accipio; illam sedem apostoli Petri et istius augustae civitatis unam esse definio." Cela veut dire que l'évêque de Rome et l'évêque de Constantinople sont d'accord, et non pas qu'il " identified his own See with the Roman See," ce qui n'a pas de sens ! Rapprochez la lettre *Quando Deus* du même Jean au même Hormisdas, qui reprend les memes termes. Et la réponse d'Hormisdas à Jean *Consideranti mihi*. *Coll. Avellan*, 161 et 169 (p. 612-624).

Jean se soumet et signe sans y rien retrancher la déclaration exigée par le pape. Il affirme que la parole du Christ à Pierre, *Tu es Petrus* et le reste, se vérifie dans ses effets, parce que "*in sede apostolica inviolabiliter semper custoditur religio.*" Il anathématise donc Nestorius, Eutychès, Dioscore, Timothée Ælure, Pierre d'Alexandrie, Acace, Pierre d'Antioche. Il reçoit toutes les lettres de S. Léon sur la foi. Il veut suivre Rome en tout : "*Sequentes in omnibus sedem apostolicam, et praedicamus omnia quae ab ipsa decreta sunt, et propterea spero in una communione vobiscum quam apostolica sedes praedicat me futurum, in qua est integra christianae religionis et perfecta soliditas.*" Il s'engage à ne pas recevoir dans les diptyches à l'avenir "*sequestratos a communione Ecclesiae catholicae, id est, in omnibus non consentientes sedi apostolicae.*"¹ Le pape ne demande pas d'autre déclaration.

La signature obtenue de l'évêque de Constantinople (mars 519), l'empereur Justin donne des ordres (avril 519) pour que les évêques signent dans toutes les provinces.² On apprend plus tard que certains évêques répugnent à supprimer dans les diptychès des noms qui sont chers à leurs ouailles.³ Ces évêques appartiennent au diocèse d'Orient, "*pars Orientalium.*"⁴ Une lettre subséquente de l'empereur Justin précise qu'il s'agit de "*nonnullae urbes tam Ponticae quam Asianae et praecipue Orientales,*"⁵ y compris Jérusalem. Ces Eglises ne refusent pas d'effacer des distiches les noms d'Acace, de Dioscore, des deux Pierres et de Timothée, mais ils refusent d'effacer les noms des évêques qui en chaque Eglise participèrent au schisme d'Acace (ce qui était plutôt insinué que réclamé par le formulaire).

L'empereur estime que le consentement du pape Hormisdas est nécessaire, il lui demande d'user d'indulgence, et encore ne lui demande-t-il cette indulgence que pour les Eglises qui résistent sur ce point bien secondaire, et non pour les Eglises qui ont déjà signé le formulaire, "*et hoc exceptis urbibus ubi vestrae beatitudinis libellus iam in plenum admissus est.*"⁶ Le pape répond à l'empereur Justin qu'il entre dans ses vues et qu'il s'en remettra au jugement du nouvel évêque de Constantinople Epiphane : les évêques donc

¹ *Collect. Avellan*, 159 (pp. 608-9), *Ibid.* append. IV (pp. 800-1) : cf. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums* (1901), p. 71.

² *Collect. Avellan*, 167 (p. 621). C'est le rapport des légats au pape : "*Noveris . . . edicta . . . per universas provincias quantocius destinari.*" Les légats notent que le peuple a acclamé l'union : "*Qualia gaudia facta sint unitatis quae laudes quoque beato Petro apostolo et vobis relatae sint . . . perspicitis.*"

³ *Ibid.* 192 (p. 650), lettre de l'empereur Justin au pape Hormisdas, 9 juillet 520.

⁴ *Ibid.* 216 (pp. 675-6) : "*Lactamur cotidie diversorum episcoporum libellos nobis satisfactionis offerri. . . . Post libellos quos dederunt et dant episcopi et per ipsos satisfecerunt sedi apostolicae.*"

⁵ *Ibid.* 232 (p. 701), 9 septembre 520.

⁶ *Ibid.* (p. 702).

qu'Epiphane aura admis à sa communion, le pape les tiendra pour sortis du schisme, étant bien entendu qu'ils auront signé le formulaire, "*libelli tamen qui a nobis interpositus est tenore servato.*"¹

On pourra conclure de là que Bishop Gore n'est pas autorisé à dire que nombre d'évêques orientaux furent admis à la communion de Rome sans signer rien d'autre qu'une confession de foi orthodoxe. Sur ce point, il s'en est rapporté au P. Pullér, dont l'exposé est à reviser de très près.²

Le dernier argument de Bishop Gore est une vieille connaissance scolaire. Si, dit-il, l'infailibilité de l'évêque de Rome en matière de foi avait été elle-même un article de foi en Orient, le pape Honorius n'aurait pas été condamné comme monothélite par le sixième et le septième concile œcuménique. On me permettra de m'en tenir au verdict de Dom Chapman : "Aucun concile n'a par ses actes et ses paroles plus pleinement reconnu l'autorité et l'infailibilité de Rome que le sixième concile qui a condamné—et condamné à bon droit—le pape Honorius."³

* * *

Serait-il possible de dégager de cet échange de vues quelques possibles points d'entente ?

I. Il ne peut être contesté que S. Pierre était le chef ou "*leader*" accepté des apôtres, et qu'il était accepté comme tel parce qu'il avait été traité comme tel par le Sauveur.

II. La papauté a pour anticipation ce "*leadership*" de S. Pierre. La papauté historique est prophétisée par le Christ dans le *Tu es Petrus*, étant bien évident que les événements de l'histoire ont projeté sur ce texte des clartés qui en rendent plus manifeste la signification réelle. La papauté est un fait providentiel, parce qu'elle a été, non pas permise, mais voulue de Dieu.

III. La papauté des premiers âges s'avère dans la sollicitude que l'Eglise de Rome a de toutes Eglises, dans l'autorité que lui donne le dépôt de la foi qu'elle conserve plus sûrement qu'aucune autre Eglise, dans le pouvoir qu'on lui reconnaît de corriger à l'occasion les autres Eglises : cette papauté-là est déjà en acte au temps de S. Irénée.

IV. Cette papauté des premiers âges était bien plus grecque que latine, car Rome était alors bien plus grecque que latine.

¹ *Ibid.*, 238 (p. 738). Lettre du 26 mars 521. L'Egypte seule se déroba à l'union. Quant à l'Illyricum oriental, il était plus romain que jamais : voyez *ibid.*, 213-5 (pp. 671-4).

² C'est ce qu'avait dit déjà Dom Chapman, *The First Eight General Councils and Infailibility* (1906), pp. 45-7.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 67. Du même, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius* (1907). Sur la question cf. E. Amann, art. *Honorius* (1921) du *Dictionnaire de la théologie catholique*.

V. A partir de Dioclétien l'Orient s'établit à part de l'Occident, et le catholicisme occidental a tendance à se serrer plus étroitement autour de Rome, tandis que le catholicisme oriental s'assujettit plutôt à la cour impériale comme à son centre d'attraction. La papauté n'est pas pour autant abolie en Orient, alors même que l'Orient s'organise en patriarchats et entend être *sui juris* : la papauté a son rôle à Ephèse, à Chalcédoine, et il n'est pas de communion catholique sans elle. Cela l'Orient ne le conteste pas, à moins de se séparer de l'unité, comme a fait l'Egypte monophysite au scandale de tout l'Orient.

Voilà ce qu'un historien peut représenter à Bishop Gore, c'est à savoir ce que la papauté est dans l'histoire des premiers cinq siècles de l'Eglise. C'est une papauté qui ne se définit qu'avec le temps, comme aussi bien c'est avec le temps qu'elle s'organise juridiquement. Et assurément Chalcédoine n'est pas plus le terme du développement du dogme de la papauté que le terme de l'évolution du *Kirchenrecht*, mais à Chalcédoine la papauté appartient ensemble à l'Orient et à l'Occident et c'est la grande leçon de l'histoire de ces premiers siècles.

PIERRE BATIFFOL.

AN AUTOGRAPH OF ST. ATHANASIUS THE GREAT.

I WONDER if our Orthodox friends have noticed a publication by the British Museum—it appeared this summer—which makes it probable, after an examination in the coldest archæological and palæographical light, that it possesses an important relic, in the form of an autograph letter from the hand of St. Athanasius himself? Probably not, for little enough notice of it has been taken in our own country, and the readers of *The Christian East* may, therefore, like to have the facts before them.

A facsimile transcript and translation of the letter are to be found in *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, by H. Idris Bell, O.B.E., together with a careful discussion as to the ascription to the Saint. Mr. Bell remarks :—" A definite decision is impossible. The most we can say is that there is at least a reasonable probability that we have in the present document a specimen of the hand of the great champion of Orthodoxy," and the grounds for this opinion may be summarised as follows :—

The papyrus is of the middle of the fourth century A.D. : the recipient one Paphnutius, an ascetic, whose correspondence has come down to us to the extent of six or seven letters : the writer an

Athanasius. "The hand," says Mr. Bell, "is an easy, bold and rather handsome one, betraying a practised writer, but on the other hand it is rather of an official type. It suggests rather a private person of education than a professional scribe." The Athanasius who wrote the letter enumerates "Theodosius, . . . Antiochus, Didyma, our mother, all they of our household": among the extant letters of St. Athanasius is one *Ἰωάννη καὶ Ἀντίῳχῳ ἀγαπητοῖς υἱοῖς καὶ συνπρεσβυτέροις*: Antiochus, a common name earlier in Egypt, is infrequent in Christian times.

The date, then, and the mention of Antiochus in the household of the writer, point in the direction of St. Athanasius. The style lends a slight corroboration. "It is very noticeably superior to the average of papyrus letters," says Mr. Bell, "and even to that of the present series (i.e., the archive of Paphnutius) itself, proceeding from a cultivated circle. Particular stress may be laid on the separation of noun and adjective in the concluding clause, *ἐρρωμένον σε ἡ θεία διαφύλαξις πρόνοια*. This is an essentially literary device, so far removed from the usual style of papyrus letters that it at once arrests attention. . . . The unusual phrase *ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτοῦ* points in the same direction, and the sentence *I therefore entreat you repeatedly, remember us; for the prayers which you offer are taken on high owing to your holy love, and according as you ask in your holy prayers, so will our state prosper* has an unmistakably literary flavour."

It is to be hoped that some Athanasian scholar will examine the vocabulary and style of the letter even more closely to search for resemblances to the known works of the Saint. Meanwhile, the reasonable degree of probability of the ascription cannot but make this document of the highest interest to students of the Orthodox East.

S. GASELEE.

ATHENS REVISITED.

WHEN one has been away from Greece for many a year, one is glad to be back again in the old familiar atmosphere and notice the changes that have come, although the familiar old landmarks are still there to console one for the other changes.

Far from Greece, one is apt to lose touch with the influence of the Church which is so strongly felt in Greece itself. It is on the spot that the atmosphere of the Greek Orthodox Church is felt, and this, because it is pre-eminently Greek in every sense. And so powerful a thing is it, that it predominates almost to the exclusion of even

the great pagan associations of the place. Here, indeed, is the Church of the Greek people, in all its antiquity and traditional richness.

What a delight to see once more the familiar churches of Athens and its suburbs, the tiny brown dome of the Kapnikaréa at the bottom of Hermes Street, against a background of purple and blue mountain! How all the little booths outside it are loaded with church ware, such as Eikons of silver, and hand-painted Eikons, every kind of incense in little earthenware jars that suggest the very essence of the religious East, and in the scent of incense burning in the open vessel of red clay containing red cinders!

There are the wooden stamps bearing the letters "IXNK," which are used on the loaf of oblation, and wooden crosses made from olive trees from Jerusalem, also strings of beads from the Holy Land. At these stalls then do the faithful housewives buy their wooden stamps for the Prosfora (loaf) which they send as an offering to the church for the Eucharist. Inside the church is the same old Candelonafta (the woman who looks after the tiny candles that are lit by people who enter, go in for a moment to say a prayer, and light a candle before the Eikons). And on this afternoon, there came into the church three little schoolgirls belonging to the people, and just out of school, who on their way home stopped to perform a religious duty with all the solemnity of their elders.

It was so charming a picture, I cannot recall it without a glow myself, at the memory of those three little maidens, as it comes back to me, tiptoeing to kiss the Eikons which they could hardly reach, at the same time making their cross reverently before each in turn.

And outside the sound of traffic and the footsteps of many people hurrying about the day's business goes on uninterruptedly round this old Sanctuary, which contains the peace of God and the faith of the three little maidens.

Another time there was the Sunday service at the Cathedral, at which the Archbishop of Athens was officiating.

During one part of the service he sat on his throne of gold, mitre on head, staff in hand. The quiet dignity of his face, above all, the expression of benign kindness and gentleness on his face, as his eyes dwelt on the congregation, struck me in a forcible manner. Here, indeed, was the worthy leader of the flock over which he had been called to minister.

In the side aisles the women and children stood, or sat, apart from the men, who filled the nave. There was a great congregation of all classes worshipping together. What an interesting congregation it was! The officers in haki, with their look of earnest attention, the poor workman, cap in hand, with the wrapt expression you so often see on the faces of the poor when in church.

The service was intensely beautiful, partly because of the melodious unaccompanied singing, partly because of the effect of the Deacon's magnificent voice echoing through the church as he read the Gospel from the "Amvon," high up, the shafts of coloured light pouring through the windows and falling on to his green and gold robe and long fair locks. The intense silence of the people, heavy with prayer; the intoning of the priests; the blessing given by the Archbishop, holding his jewelled cross on high, as he stands at the entrance to the centre gate of the Eikonostasion and his words thrill through the full church.

A moment after and he is distributing the Antidoron to the congregation, who receive it from his hand, a very charming picture of the Shepherd feeding His flock.

No, there seems no falling off in worshippers, for to go to church in Greece is part of the people's life, as being an expression of their faith and the everyday customs which are so intimately interwoven. Religion is to them entirely connected with the worship of the supernatural as the soul's expression of a very imaginative people. It is an intimate and very human affair of life itself, and, for that reason, so fresh and poetic an element in their lives.

For instance, the continual reading of a prayer by the priest for anyone who wishes him to do so is a very usual custom. Generally they go to one of the smaller churches for this service, which always takes place in the afternoon.

On the north side of the Acropolis Rock, in fact in the oldest quarter of the town of Athens, of classic and mediæval days, there are a host of little churches, very ancient and very beautiful, both in form and interior. In wandering through the narrow streets I have often, in passing one of these churches, heard the intoning of the reader, while the faint smell of incense has been mingled with the spring air, which tells me that a Paraclisis is being read for someone's benefit.

A Paraclisis is literally a prayer offered by the priest. Against a background of dark shadow lit by the multi-coloured dull golds, reds and blues of the Eikons and other decoration of St. Nicholas Raghavas there is a priest, wearing his dalmatic, near a little table in the centre of the nave. He is reading the special prayers for the occasion, most of which are taken from the service of Vespers. The reader chants some of the Psalms. The women hold lighted candles. The oil in the Kandyles is replenished, the priest gives his blessing to the people by sprinkling them with the piece of Basil dipped in water, and holding up the Cross for them to kiss, after which they all disperse.

It is a homely scene and not without attraction, for it gives the democratic side of the Greek Church in all its simplicity and kindly-

ness. The priest who conducts these services is one of the people ; except for his office he is one of themselves. He participates in their joys and their sorrows ; lives their lives, and ministers to them at the great moments of birth, marriage and death.

The great strength of the Church lies in this fact, that the priests never lose touch with the people's lives. In the humbleness of faith that animates both, there is, perhaps, a deeper spirituality and faith than the more educated would be capable of.

This wonderful faith is illustrated even more abundantly among the refugees from Asia Minor and Thrace.

What an example it is to see these people, robbed of everything that makes life worth living, carrying on so bravely !

Clinging to their faith, which is even stronger than it was in prosperity, believing and trusting. Never cast down in persecution, living in the simple worship of their faith, brave beyond words, for their suffering must, indeed, be, at times, more than they can bear.

There is a settlement of them near the seashore at Phalerum, which I passed one day. A collection of tiny wooden huts with one just a little larger than the others, over which there is a simple wooden cross. It was the church the refugees had built themselves, and the aged priest sitting outside the door was a refugee himself.

He had escaped, he told me, with his flock, and continued to minister to them as in their village, near the sea, as their present abode was. It was just a little bare place, with a rough wooden screen shutting out the altar from the rest of the church, a few crudely coloured Eikons, and a couple of cheap oil lamps burning before the Sanctuary. It was all they could manage. Of what matter was it, however, as long as the priest was there with his flock ? To the people gathered there to hear him recite the office of the day, in the familiar words of the faith they loved more than anything, the church amidst the huts that, alas, are all that is left to them, is for them their true home.

Yet the pathos of it struck me more than anything else I had seen in Greece ; it was so illustrative of the tragedy that had befallen a whole world. Amidst all the cruel things one heard of in those days, there was in this passive tragedy, so to speak, something that made one want to weep most.

Kalithea is a suburb of Athens, and lies between the town and the sea at Phalerum. Archæologists say that it is the site of the ancient Sikelia, so called because of the three hills in the shape of Trinacria, or Sicily, which are quite close by. Kalithea lies, indeed, near these hills, bare and scarred, of red rock, and on which the wild asphodel and anemones grow in spring. There are villas with gardens, in which pomegranate trees grow, rich with great crimson blossoms.

and oranges and lemons, while the ethereal pink and white of the pear and almond blossom just adds a more delicate tone to the whole.

The views of mountain, sea and Athens, or rather, the delicate outline of the Parthenon and Propylea, from the villa, is intensely beautiful. There is no hour at which this wonderful ruin is not beautiful; so radiant, so fresh and so flower-like is it; as fragrant as a daffodil with the morning dew on, have I seen it in the early dawn of a spring day . . . or transfigured with the golden light of sunset against the purple-shadowed mountain behind.

Amid such surroundings, which stimulate the imagination, it is not surprising that the people who live in Greece should "see visions and dream dreams," in the Biblical sense.

"I dreamed a dream," the old man told me, when I asked him about the tiny little church in his own grounds, little more, indeed, than a chapel, facing the common at Kalithea.

"Years ago I was very ill, and while asleep one day, I saw a beautiful woman dressed as a nun standing by my bedside. She told me I should get well. I cried out: 'It is Saint Barbara,' and the others heard me. When I got well, I went to Kalamas, and tried to find out whether there was a church, or even an Eikon, of the Saint. But I could find nothing. I had several Liturgies said, and more than once the Saint was revealed to me in my dreams. I christened girls by the name of Barbara; and yet could I not find her church. When, finally, one day I went again to Kalamas and, after the Liturgy, a peasant came to me and told me of a place known as Saint Barbara near the old ruins of the monastery of Vlacharena. So we dug and found the foundations and walls of a church, and a marble plaque of reddish colour engraved with the Saint's picture, and belonging to the fifth century A.D. We were overwhelmed by emotion, and after paying reverence to the Eikon, we carried it to the nearest church, and left it there for the people to see.

"I built up the old foundations again into a church, and I have built this little chapel, and dedicated it to Saint Barbara. The valuable marble plaque is reinstated in its new church, and I have made a copy of it for this chapel."

It is in the traditional Byzantine style, the Saint is holding a bunch of grapes, at which a bird is plucking, near a pomegranate tree. There is a wreath of myrtle round the figures, and you have all the symbolic designs used by the artist of old.

Thus the piety of this man has provided a place of worship for those unable to climb the hill, where the parish church is. No consecration has yet taken place, but one day the tiny bell was calling us all to prayer, and we found that there was a Paraclissis going on. The Archbishop had sent the Antimision, a square cloth depicting the burial of Our Lord, which has been blessed for this purpose of

the consecration of a church, and which enabled a service to be held. The Antiminsion was laid over the table in the Sanctuary. This Antiminsion is also used on the battlefield, or at sea when it is necessary to hold a celebration of the Eucharist.

There are classical associations, too, in the hamlet of Sikelia, to use its classical name, for on the eve of that ill-omened expedition to Sicily which was to prove the doom of Imperial Athens, the Oracle at Delphi delivered itself of an apocryphal saying connected with this very locality of Sikelia.

The Oracle told the Athenians, when they consulted her what they should do, "to enclose Sikelia," in other words to fortify this part of outlying Athens, which would be liable to an attack from the enemy. But Alcibiades, eager for glory, read another meaning into the words of Pythia. History tells us with what results.

As is so often the case in Greece, there is that blending of classical and Christian, especially to be found in the churches, which are more often than not built on the sites of old pagan temples. Kalithea, in the days when it was Sikelia, is not likely to have been an exception to the rule, as I soon discovered. For on the hill lying to the south, is the church of Hagia Sotira, which is the parish church of Kalithea, and there are to be seen fragments of sculptured marble that must have adorned the Temple of the Goddess Hera. A piece of cornice there, a capital there, a fallen column, and the evidence is clear before us of the existence of the ancient place of worship. Classical ground, to be sure, every inch of it!

These are the delights in store for one in Greece. Still more interesting did the walk up the hill become, when I found the church full of the people of Kalithea, who had gathered *en masse* to assist at the consecration of a Deacon.

All the candelabra in the church were lighted, and there were festive garlands everywhere, as if for a marriage. Indeed, it was in some ways akin to a wedding ceremony, this taking of the Church for a spouse.

The Bishop sat upon his throne. After the recitation of the Creed and the Sanctification of the Holy Gifts (Τίμια Δῶρα) in the Liturgy, and the chorus has sung the hymn to the Virgin, "Axios Estin," the about-to-be ordained Deacon is conducted by other Deacons to the Bishop, who says aloud to him, "Kelevson, Kelevson" ("Call, oh my Lord, this man to be ordained"). The Bishop and priests with the Deacon then withdraw into the Sanctuary, and while the chorus chants the hymn, "Rejoice, O Esaias," etc., out of the Greek marriage ceremony, leads the newly consecrated Deacon three times round the Altar. Troparia are chanted, connected with the festive character of the service, after which the prayers of consecration are read over the Neophyte, in order to endow him with the Gift of the

Holy Ghost. These prayers are not read aloud, and while the Bishop is reciting them, the chorus sings the "Kyrie Eleison" over and over again. Finally, the Deacon emerges, wearing his vestment, which is a plain white gown across which he wears the Orarion, in the same way as does an Anglican Deacon, on which the congregation cry out, "Worthy, Worthy," and the service is ended.

In this classic land you are back in the days of the old, yet ever new, things. And when you have been reading Pausanias' description of Greece and the Acts of the Apostles, you will then begin to understand that, although both were written many centuries ago, you may still capture the atmosphere of each, which take on an extra significance when one is living in Greece.

E. KEPHALA.

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE—*Cont. from p. 154.*

Celebrations of the Sixteenth Centenary of the Great Council of Nicæa will be held throughout the Christian World in May and June next year. The Orthodox are considering holding an Ecumenical Conference in Jerusalem as part of their Commemoration. If so, an Anglican delegation will be invited. The American Church has appointed a Committee, with Bishop Gailor and Dr. Emhardt among its personnel, to prepare a programme for America, and we understand that what is to be done in England is under consideration by the authorities.

* * * * *

The death of the Bishop of Zanzibar (Dr. Weston) is as great a loss to the whole Church as to his Diocese. In particular we grieve at his loss as a devoted friend of Reunion with the East. "I want to die," he wrote one of our editors last April, "in communion with Constantinople." That desire was not realised in the letter, but assuredly it was in the spirit. *R.I.P.*

* * * * *

The Fellowship meetings organised by the Bishop of Khartum at Heliopolis are always intensely interesting and have produced important results. We were particularly glad to have an admirable statement made by the Armenian Bishop Thorgam as to the position of his Church. It is doubtful whether we can find room for it, but we should wish it in print.

* * * * *

The Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev has returned to Belgrad from Palestine and Antioch. The Patriarch Photios of Alexandria recently visited Jerusalem, and was received with great distinction. The Patriarch Damianos of Jerusalem undertook a sea voyage in November, stopping in the Bosphorus and going on to Bucharest when, such a visit being unprecedented, the King and Queen, as well as the Metropolitan, gave him a warm welcome.

Eastern Church Books.

THE RELATIONS OF THE ARMENIAN CHURCHES WITH THE EASTERN ORTHODOX. By the Rev. J. A. DOUGLAS, B.D. 1904 pp. Price 12s. Popular edition, 3/6.

"These two books are books about the subject should read the Douglas volume, as I have done in my own study." *The Archbishop of Canterbury to Cambridge.* Feb. 1905, 1906.

A DICTIONARY OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH. By Dr. H. L. LANGFORD-JAMES. Price 7/6.

WHO'S WHO IN THE EARLY CHURCH. By Rev. W. C. PERRY. 7s. 6d.
LIVES IN THE CHAIN OF RUSSIAN CHURCH HISTORY. By Dr. W. H. PERRY, Bishop of THURO. Price 7/6. Popular edition, 3/6.

THE REDEMPTION OF ST. SOPHIA. By the Rev. J. A. DOUGLAS, B.D. Introduction by Bishop GORE. Fourth Edition. Price 2s. 6d. paper; cloth, 5s.

"A standard authority."—*Eastern Review.* "The subject has recently attracted Mr. Douglas's hand. It is probable all that need be known on the subject."—*Church Times.*

THE CHURCH AND FAITH OF ARMENIA. By Dr. ANSEL ABRAHAMIAN, Armenian Vespasian in London. Price 2s. 6d. paper; cloth, 5s.

"All interested in the Armenian Question should read this."—*Armenian Times.*

ARMENIAN CHURCH CUSTOMS AND THE MURDER OF MAR SHNUN. By Lady SUSAN D'HAUT MAR SHNUN. Introduction by the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. Commentary by Dr. WIGRAM. Price 2s. 6d. paper.

THE RUSSIAN RESCUE CAMP. By Bishop-General M. H. AVSEY. Paper, 2s. 6d.

THE SPIRITUAL REBIRTH OF RUSSIA. By DANCOS NIKOLAI VILKHOV. 2s. 6d. paper.

STEFANOS NIKOLAI. By COMMANDER LUTER. 2s. 6d. paper.

PICTURES OF RUSSIAN WORSHIP. By the Rev. J. A. DOUGLAS, B.D. 1s. 6d.

DEATH'S KING IN ANATOLIA AND ASIA MINOR. By the Rev. J. A. DOUGLAS, B.D. 6d.

SERMONS OF EASTERN CHURCH LIFE. By EUGENIUS KHALIL. Introduction by the Bishop of LONDON. Paper, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 5s.

THE RUSSIAN AND ARMENIAN CHURCHES. By HAROLD BENTON. 6d.

INTERCOMMUNION WITH THE ARMENIAN CHURCH. By the Rev. Dr. W. A. WIGRAM. 6d.

THE RUSSIAN LITURGY OF ST. CECILIA. Translated by the Rev. F. G. BRIGHTMAN, M.A., from the Greek and collated with the Slavonic. 2s. 6d.

THE SEPARATION OF THE RUSSO-ARMENIANS. By the Rev. Dr. W. A. WIGRAM. 7s. 6d.

THE ALL-ARREST VIEW OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH. Translation edited by the Revs. B. TIMOTHY, B.D., and V. THORNTON. 1s.

FAITH PRESS, Ltd., 22, Southampton St., Clerkenwell, W.C.2.

